organised. But, what Mr. Gujral has said satisfies us.

Now, may I call upon Shri Satish Agarwal to continue his speech?

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1996-97 (Contd.)

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (RAJASTHAN): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I am just interrupting at this moment in the beginning and not in between ....*(Interruptions)*.... because there are other Members from your party who want to speak.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Sir, I am aware of that. Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, for permitting to conclude my speech on the Union Budget (General) today. While initiating the debate on the Union Budget (General) - 1996-97, I had tried my level best to rise above petty political considerations and put before this august House my approach to the whole process of Budget formulation, Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates, Government expenditure - Plan as well as non-plan - and the total state of economy that is prevalent there.

I had also tried to put a bench mark as to on what basis the whole economic performance should be judged and in that connection, I had referred to one method - Balance-sheet Method - whereby we can assess the performance of a company in which we want to invest in shares; so is the case with the Government of India. In that way I had made a very specific points that in the year 1980-81, the excess of liabilities over assets, was just Rs. 450 crores while in the year 1996-97 the excess of liabilities over assets has reached a staggering figure of Rs. 2,42,530.67 crores. Sir, in this connection, my problem today has become more complex because I have much more material than what the time permits and moreover I have got two other members of my party who want to participate in the debate. Hence, today, I will try my level best to condense my speech in as short time as possible. Now, Sir, with this one good reason, I will be skipping over many aspects which I wanted to deal with.

Now, according to the Update Economic Survey which the hon. Finance Minister has presented to the House - I quote: "The rising interest burden could reach an unsustainable level unless efforts are made to contain it through reduction of fiscal deficit and retirement of a part of the debt. As a proportion of the revenue receipts, interest payments rose from 39% in the year 1991 to 47% in 1995-96. The high growth of revenue expenditure also throws up another challenge: less money is available for capital expenditure or investment while the share of revenue expenditure in total Central Government expenditure has increased from 69.8% in 1991 to 78.4% in 1995-96 and that of capital expenditure has fallen from 30.2% to 21.6%. "Now, my whole worry is this. As I stated yesterday, I am not against borrowings. But borrowings are for what? Borrowings should not be to meet the rising revenue expenditure. Borrowings should be utilised for creation of assets. But unfortunately, we have failed to create assets over the last so many years, more particularly, during the last five years. We have created an excess of liabilities over assets by more than Rs. 1,40,000 crores which this year has reached a staggering figure of Rs. 2,40,000 crores. So, I am not against borrowings. I am not against levying of taxes. I am not even against other social security measures. But the question is this: In what direction we are heading? Now, the Finance Minister derives satisfaction from the fact that our fiscal deficit has been brought down to 5% of the GDP, say from 6% or 7% or from 8%. According to me, this is not a correct barometer to judge the level of fiscal deficit. Fiscal deficit represents the borrowing requirements of the Government and borrowing requirements have to be for meeting the capital expenditure and not revenue expenditure. So, when a judgement has to be made, a measurement has to be made about the level of fiscal deficit, it should be in relation to the capital expenditure - how much capital expenditure we are incurring and what is the level of fiscal deficit. In short, Sir, in this connection, I would like to give some data which I have calculated. In the year 1987-88 fiscal deficit as a percentage of capital expenditure was 151%.

Now, over the years, it has doubled; it has crossed the 200-mark. That means, for every one-and-a-half rupee we used to spend, we used to borrow one rupee. But what is the position today? Whatever we spend, we borrow two rupees. Of this, we spend only one rupee by way of capital expenditure; just half of it. The remaining half we utilise for meeting Government expenditure to which I seriously object. Therefore, I say, the parameter for measuring the fiscal deficit should not be the GDP. It is just an estimate; it may be more; it may be less. It is neither in your hands nor in my hands. It depends on the vagaries of nature also. That is why I would say that the proper parameter for measuring the leve of fiscal deficit should be in relation to the capital expenditure.

Now, Sir, I am leaving so many other points at this stage. I now come to the points made by the hon. Finance Minister in the Economic Survey.

The Finance Miniser, in his updated Economic Survey, has addressed three areas of challenge. One is with regard to fiscal adjustment; the other is with regard to infrastructure; the third is with regard to the poverty and unemployment programmes.

Now, there is a great controversy going on in the country as to what is the number of poor in the country. What is the level of poverty? What is the number of people living below the poverty line?

According to Government statistics, Government figures, for 1987-88, it is - rural - 28 per cent; urban - 17 per cent; combined - 26 per cent. For the year 1993-94, the fitures are: rural - 22 per cent; urban - 12 per cent; combined - 19 per cent. These are Government figures. According to Government figures, Government statistics, the percentage of people living below the poverty line is coming down. That is why they claim that it is a success of their Five-Year Plans; it is a success of the various schemes that they had launched.

But Sir, I have got with me an 'Alternative Economic Survey' for the year 1995-96. This is by the Alternative Survey Group. It is published by the Delhi Science Forum. On page 37, they have given, after a careful scrutiny and evaluation of all the data in regard to poverty available with them, the figures. The economists are: Abhijit Sen and C.P. Chandrashekhar and, probably, one more gentleman; I think his name is Mr. Amartya Sen. They have said here: 'The Economic Survey 1995-96 gives the poverty figures for 1987-88 and 1993-94 (one per reform year and one post reform year) in order to support the claim that poverty has declined in the post reform years. These reference points are clearly misleading'. The sources they had taken are: S.P. Gupta's book - 'Recent Economic Reforms and their impact on the Poor and Vulnerable Sections of Society' and Abhijit Sen and C.P. Chandrashekhar, Business Line, 23rd January, 1996.

According to them, the percentage of population living below the poverty line - combined figure - in 1987-88 was 39.3; in January-December, 1992, it went up to 40.69 per cent. This not my statement. It is the statement of prominent economists of this country who have brought out an 'Alternative Economic Survey'. They have dealt with other subjects also. But on account of paucity of time, I am skipping over all the other points except to point out that so far as the figure in regard to the number of people living below the poverty line is concerned, this is the data they have come up with, together with their arguments, their assessment and their evaluation.

In this connection, I would like to point out that while replying to a question in regard to the public distribution system for the poor, Mr. Devendra Prasad Yadav made a mention in the House that the number of people living below the poverty line is near about 40 per cent. I pinned him down on that day, on that particular figure. Therefore, this is the position. I leave this point here. This is the number of people living below the poverty line. Therefore, the Government should not be under any misconception that the number of people living below the povertyline is coming down.

Here, I would like to give another statistics. Sir, we had a debate on agriculture, landless labour, etc. What about capital formation? After all, seventy per cent of the people in our country live in the rural areas.

If the capital formation is much more than the desired level, then naturally the presumption and inference would be that things are not as rosy as they are depicted to be. Capital formation in agriculture in 1995-96 was Rs. 399.38 crores and for 1996-97 it is Rs. 371.21 crores. Now according to an answer given just yesterday in reply to a question of Shri O.P. Kohli on 28.6.96, the total child labour population in India was 17 million then, that is about two crore children. You can very well imagine the state of affairs in the rural India. There can be another for you to judge; that is, with regard to the people living below the poverty line. I am reading the data from the World Development Report 1996—Plan to Market. How do you judge? What have been the national objectives of our planning right from the First Plan in 1951? During all these years we have spend around rupees fifteen lakh crores over all these Plans. The national objectives in all these Plans have been, by and large, removal of poverty, unemployment, income distribution and regional imbalances. Has it not been the case in all these years of our Plans? Apart from some emphasis here and there, sometimes on agriculture, sometimes on industrial development and now it is on environment also. But by and large, throughout these 45 years of planning in this country the emphasis of any Government whosoever was in saddle in Delhi, had been removal of poverty, income disparities, unemployment and regional imbalances. Now, I come to the other point, that is income distribution. This is from Plan to Market, World Development Report 1996—distribution of income and consumption lowest 10%; consumed 3.7% only; and highest 10%; consumed 28.4%. If you go up to the second break-up of 20%, lowest 20%; consumed 8.5%, and highest 20%; consumed 42.6%. These are the economic disparities. That is the level of society available in India as on date. There is a class of very rich people who are enjoying the fruits of development. Their number may be 10 to 20%. There are people below the poverty line. They may be 30% or 40%. Whatever may be the number, they are living in abject poverty, they are denied the basic needs of life—that is, food, cloth, shelter, education and medicine. That is a hard reality. And we all had to put our shoulders together as to how to tackle these problems; these are not party problems, these are national problems. We have to put our heart and shoulder togther to find out solutions to these problems. That is the whole thing and that is what is borne out by all these statistics. Why has the situation become so? Because we are great experts in projecting very wrong data. The World Bank data is 100% based on the data supplied by the Government of India. They will supply wrong data to Parliament but they will never supply wrong data to IMF. Why?—Dr. Biplap Dasgupta will ask. Now, growth of the economy. The GDP which was 5.8% during 1980-90 was 3.8% between 90—94. Regarding agriculture, during 1980—90 it was 3.1% and during 1990-94 it was 2.9%. In industry, during 1980—90 it was 7.1% and during 1990—94 it was 3.2%.

In Services, from 1980 to 1990 it was 6.9 per cent and from 1990-91 it is 4.6 per cent. These are hard facts. One cannot shut one's eyes to all these. You have to bear in mind all these things and then decide.

Now I will give another indicator, and that is with regard to per capita income. It is from the Economic Survey. It is right from 1951. At 1980-81 prices, in 1951 the per capita income was Rs 1,126.9, say, Rs 1,127/-. In 1994-95, provisional, it is Rs 2,400/-. That has just doubled over the last 45, 46 years. The per capita income has just doubled, according to the Economic Survey. What about Government expenditure over the years? Has it only doubled? Has the revenue deficit only doubled? If my memory does not fail me, I distinctly remember, on the basis of a book made available to me by my esteemed colleague, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, in 1984 when he was the Finance Minister—I had raised the issue in Parliament and then he made a compilation of all the Budget speeches of all the Finance Ministers right from 1947 to 1984, and I have that particular book—in 1947-48 the total deficit was Rs 1.9 crores, that is, one crore and ninety lakhs only. And what is the position today? Per capita income has doubled, but what about expenditure? It has gone up a hundred-fold. If you look to the initial, First Five-Year Plan, it was of Rs 2,000 crores. Today our Plan is of near about Rs 800,000 crores. What about other Government expenditure? Where does

this money go? I am not at all worried about it so far as these things are concerned. If you look at the per capita income at constant prices, you will find very, very, very large variations: from Rs 3,000 in Bihar, you will find that somewhere it is Rs 12,000, somewhere else Rs 10,000, or Rs 11,000 in some other State and something more elsewhere.The difference is 1:4 in between these States. Are these not regional imbalances which have occurred in our economy? How are we to look after the States which are backward? Where is the money going, after all? How is the money being utilized? I want the Government to bring a White Paper as to who has benefited through Government expenditure all through these years. And who has borne the brunt of taxation all these years? I brought a booklet, a study, by Prof. Anand P. Gupta of the Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, last time when I spoke on the Budget.In that particular study, Prof. Anand P. Gupta, who was once upon a time a member of the Expenditure Commission of the Government of India, brought it out that the beneficiary of Government expenditure is the affluent class and the tax burden is the heaviest on the lower classes. That was the whole conclusion or gist of that particular study. I want this Government to bring out a White Paper for our understanding, to avoid, in times to come, all controversies as to who has benefited and to what extent, through Government expenditure all these years. A study should be made. No study is made. Even in matters of taxation, what are you doing? Sometimes I feel like laughing at all these things.

What have you provided in this Budget? In the 1995-96 Budget, for water supply and sanitation you had provided Rs 363.24 crores. This time it is only Rs 363.26 crores—just two lakhs more. For welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, the provision in 1995-96 was Rs 72.41 crores, and this time you have provided Rs 61.81 crores. For rural employment you had provided Rs 4,173.22 crores in 1995-96. And this year, how much is provided by this pro-poor Government where the Prime Minister every day comes to the House with that one song, "I come from a farmer's family, I come from a rural family, I am a very poor man, I stand for the poor, my Government stands for the poor"?

I have got that particular pamphlet of his speech here with me now. He has been saying this *bona fide*. These are complex problems which are beyond one's immediate understanding, of one who has come from a State background. So, I wish that the Prime Minister of this country should understand the complex problems of public finance, external finance, debt problems, borrowings, fiscal deficits and not all the time talking about the poor. Even if you talk about the poor, these are allocations. You should not behave like a Chief Minister of India. You are the Prime Minister of India. So, Sir, rural employment allocation has come down from Rs. 4,173.22 crores to Rs. 3,476.03 crores. Old-age homes for people like me and N.K.P. Salve, who have crossed sixty...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): I am young.

SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I object to this. He is not in that category.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I think, you include Jogi in that category. He has the wisdom of the old.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: I am prepared to include the Presiding Officer also. Sir, you are nearing 70 or more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): You can include me. It is allright.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: According to the definition, a person more than 65 years of age is a senior citizen. Dr. Manmohan Singh was the first man to extend the tax benefit to senior citizens, though I have not been able to avail of that benefit as yet. Anyway, now, how much have you given for the Old Age Homes? Rs. 5 crores. Training-cum-Production Centres: Rs. 10 crores. *Ex-gratia* for Truck Drivers who died in accidents is also Rs. 5 crores. Why are you cutting jokes? It is better not to allocate such petty sums. Truck drivers dying in accidents all over the countryt--Rs. 5 crores--as if accidents are in you hands. You can issue a directive or a whip to the truck drivers not to meet with accidents. This is a ridiculous thing that you are doing.

Now I come to the next point. How do we manage the whole economy? It may be

sometimes an efficient mismanagement of the economy. The Congress people were so efficient in their management. So, it was not an inefficient management, but it was an efficient mismanagement of the economy, if I may say so, at the cost of my old colleague, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, though I pay many compliments to him. It was he, who, on the basis of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee chaired by me in 1981-82, introduced the MAT in 1983. He brought that 30 per cent minimum tax that you will have to pay. Now, why did you do away with that, your Janata Dal Government being a pro-poor Government; your V.P. Singh being the messiah of the poor? Even there you claim you are pro-poor. Pro-poor is not by pronouncements; pro-poor has to be by your actions and conduct. (*Interruptions*) Yes, I paid compliments then and I pay compliments even now, whoever deserves it. At every political level at every party level we are facing national problems.

Now, I come to the last but one subject. We are pumping in so much money to the banking sector. We provided Rs. 5,700 crores for capital adequacy norms in one year's budget and Rs. 5700 crores in the second year's. Are we subsidising them? There is a limit to subsidy. You are talking of subsidy to the poor people—food subsidy, fertiliser subsidy. How much is there? I gave you the figures yesterday. It is coming down. If anything out of the three components of the non-Plan expenditure is coming down, it is the subsidy, which is coming down. The percentage of subsidy is coming down. The percentage of defence expenditure is coming down. But the percentage of interest payments is doubling. It is going up. That is exactly what I mean. Now, why are you subsidising all these things? What is the purpose of the banking sector? How much is it? This is the latest information that I have. Non-performing assets of public sector banks. I want to go into much more details.

According to the particular data made available to me, the amount of performing assets in respect of the State Bank group that is the State Bank of India the State Bank of Bikaner, the State Bank of Hyderabad the State Bank of Indore, the State Bank of Mysore etc. in 1993-94, 1994-95 and 1995-96, is roundabout Rs. 14,000 crores. I am mentioning only about the State Bank group. Then, there are a lot of banks which have incurred expenditure on these non-performing assets. The non-performing assets of the total public sector banks comes to Rs. 41,041.33 crores. This is the position. This is the Government's figure, not my figure, not the CPM figure not the CPI figure or the Congress figure. This is the position. This is the legacy of the past. ..(*Interruptions*)... No I tell you that will not do. Mr. Balu I would tell you one thing and I said it on earlier occasions also in Hindi it is called "आत्मश्लाघा" और "परनिन्दा"।

Self-praise and condemnation of others has become the national character of India. You do away with this thing. If there is something good with the Congress, I would say it is good. If something is wrong with the Congress, I would say it is wrong. Sb, please don't take the plea that it is a legacy of the past. At least the Finance Minister can't take this plea because he was a part of the Cabinet for all these years. He was a part of the Government. He can't take that plea. Circumstances forced him to stab the Congress party in their back and go to the other side the Maanila Congress and all that. I am not referring to that.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI T.R. BAALU): He has not stabbed. He has been stabbed.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: I do not appreciate those people who stab in the back of a party.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Let us not raise this issue here. We can deal with the stabbing business outside the House.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: So, this is your non-performing assets.

Now what about your bad debts? The amount on bad debts, actually written off from 1993-94 to 1994-95 is an astronomical figure. वे नान-परफार्मिंग ऐसेट्स तो आपके हैं।

You will be able to realise them some day or the other. But the amount on account of bad debts actually written off from 1993-94 to 1994-95, year-wise and bank-wise, latest figures have been given here. It is an astronomical figure which runs into thousands of crores of rupees.

Only the State Bank group is something like Rs. 41,599 crores in 1993-94. In 1994-95, it is Rs. 13,313 crores. I do not want to take the time of the House and quote these figures. But the figure is astronomical. Where are we leading this country to? How are we going to meet all this? You are just after the FDI, FDI, FDI. What is the FDI? How much are you going to get from the FDI? How much did you get from the FDI? You are only after the FDI. How many approvals have you given? You are running after the FDI. Everybody is running after the FDI for $2 billion, $2 billion, Rs. 7,000 crores. From whom did you get this Rs. 7,000 crores? From Harshad Mehta. He owes indirect taxes to the Government of India. His outstanding tax liability is Rs. 6,000 crores. Bhupen Dalal's outstanding tax liability is Rs. 5,000 crores. According to the CAG report, what is the total outstanding tax liability? The total amount of tax remaining uncollected as on the 31st March 1995 was Rs. 22,698.64 crores. This is not my document. This is your CAG's latest report. Why don't you collect this money? Why don't you take action against Harshad Mehta or Bhupen Dalal or Narottam Shah and so many other people—I do not know—in the securities scam? Where is that money? You don't realise it. You don't realise it even against corporations. It is a very astounding figure. The net arrears is up to Rs. 1,00,475 crores. Over Rs. 1 lakh, it is Rs. 248 crores. Over Rs. 10 lakhs, it is Rs. 643 crores. So many other figures are there. More than Rs. 10 lakhs you are not able to recover Rs. 643 crores. I have not gone into the details because I got this report here just now. This report was not made available to me earlier. When I saw this figure which is more than Rs. 22,000 crores outstanding against direct taxes it really shocked me. I am not referring to the underestimation the undercollection, wrong computation and all that.

And you have a big paraphernalia all over the country. Mr. Salve will dwell more on this. But this is the hard reality. The banking sector and arrears of taxes, I have already tuched. And then you have Harshad Mehtas and Bhupen Dalals against whom Rs. 6000 crores, Rs. 5000 crores and Rs. 3000 crores are outstanding. They are on record. I can bring them and show it to you if you do not believe me. This is the Tenth Finance Commission Report in which every Member of this House is interested because this gives more money to the States. You are talking of cooperative federalism. You are part of the Central Government. The TDP is a part, the DMK is a part; the AGP is a part; the TMC is a part; they may be part of a part because the person who is the head of the TMC in Tamil Nadu is a Member of the Congress Party in the Rajya Sabha. You may take the stand that it is a different matter. I am not concerned. I will also not refer to the Indian Bank case. Mr. R. Kumar will refer to it. how the TMC people are involved in that, how much bungling has taken place in the Indian Bank. I do not want to refer to the names of my colleagues sitting over here and say how they are involved. But what about the Tenth Finance Commission Report? This Alternate Devolution Formula was to be implemented from 1.4.96. What happened to this? This is the Finance Commission's report. What do they say? This is also a matter of concern for all of us in Paragraph 2.5, they say.

"The macro-economic vulnerability of the economy is linked in no small measure to the secular deterioration in its fiscal balance. The magnitudes of aggregate deficits, revenue and fiscal, have reached levels in the late 80s that set the economy on a medium turn path by speculation and recurring balance of payments problems."

It was not only in 1989. Don't go to that. We have already blamed those people who were in power in 1989-90 or 1990-91. But this has started in 1980s. Then they say, "From a revenue surplus economy...". It was never a deficit economy. That way, I give credit to Mrs. Gandhi. She managed the economy well. "From a revenue surplus economy we moved into a state of continuous deficit on revenue account in 1992-93." This is not my document. "From a revenue surplus economy, we moved into a state of continuous deficit on revenue account in 1990-91. While in 1975-76, there was a revenue surplus of 2.5 per Cent on Gross Domestic Product, in 1990-91, revenue deficit reached 3.6 per cent and it is estimated to be about five per cent of Gross Domestic Product in 1993-94. This rise has even been faster than

that in the Fiscal deficit which increased from *six per cent in 1974-75 to about 10 per cent in* 1990-91. It is estimated to be 11.5 per cent in 1993-94." A graphical presentation of the trends and patterns in the finances of the Centre and the States is given in Appendix I. This is what the Finance Commission has said. Was it shown to be 11.5 per cent in 1993-94? Either this is wrong or the projection placed before Parliament for 1993-94 that the fiscal deficit is 7.4 per cent or 7.7 per cent is wrong. Is that wrong or is the Finance Commssion's report wrong? Tell me which is wrong. Mr. Salve, which is wrong? I think the Finance Commission cannot be wrong. The figures quoted here that the fiscal deficit during 1993-94 has been brought down to 7.4 per cent they projected it as 4.7 per cent, but it is 7.4 per cent—are absolutely bogus. Why these figures for Parliament? Why are you not implementing all these? Why are you not putting the customs revenue and the corporation revenues in the divisible pool? This Scheme should have come into force from 1.4.96. You will say that they did not bring it into force. This will not do. This is not an alibi which I can permit. You are answerable. Why did you not bring an amendment to the Constitution so as to include customs duties and corporation taxes in the divisible pool so as to make more funds available to the States for development of areas and sectors which exclusively remain to them.....like sanitation, rural health, agriculture, primary education. These areas or subjects are within their domain. You are not giving them resources, but you are encroaching upon their domain. You are thinking of those subjecs which are their subjects. Within the resources available they will do it themselves. You give resources to the panchayats, the local bodies, the municipal boards. They will take care of themselves. It will be better utilised. Now what is our experience? The last point, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that I would like to make is this. I leave all these documents—the Centre for monitoring Indian Economy and all that. I leave all these documents; I do not have the time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): You have practically consumed the time.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: The time of my party? No, I have not yet. But my party has acquiesced in my consuming the time; they do *not object to that. My leader is here. And you* can also put an embargo if you feel that I am speaking irrelevant! Anyway, Sir, the last point. Mr. Balu, will you be able to understand if I speak something in Hindi? If I say something in Hindi, will you be able to understand, Mr. Balu?

SHRI T.R. BAALU: No, no, no.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: No, you will not be able to understand. All right.

SHRI T.R. BAALU: We would like to hear the flowery language of Mr. Satish Agarwal.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: No, no; I will narrate this story in English. I can do that. This is the last point, Sir. When I was a student in my primaries, we were given a sum by our mathematics teacher: "Boys, here is a tank and there is a tap to fill in that tank. How much time will it take to fill in this tank which is 5' in height and 3' in diameter?" That was the question that was given to me and that might have been given to many others in their primary schools and high schools. That was the question. Then the boys answered in their own way. Here the question is that there is a tank and there is a tap. I can tell you how much time it will take to fill in the tank provided there is no hole beneath it. There is no hole beneath it! The whole problem is this. In this country the size of the tap is smaller than the size of the hole. It is getting bigger and bigger; bigger and bigger! That is one reason why there are leakages and pilferages. Corruption is the main issue to which the Finance Minister has not adressed in his speech. That is the burning problem of this country as late Rajiv Gandhi remarked forthrightly, honestly and sincerely that only 15 paise reach the beneficiary! According to a statement made by Mr. Rajesh Pilot—he was the then Minister or Internal Security—"Only seven paise reach the beneficiary!" I take all of them. Rajiv Gandhi was the tallest of all of them. If I take Rajiv Gandhi's perception that only 15 pisa reach the actual beneficiary, where does the 85 per cent go?" The tap is 15"; the hole is 85"! How will the tank be filled up? I ask how the tank will be filled up. What do you do? What is the response of the Parliament with regard to corruption? I am not referring to any particular incident today. There are a series

of scandals in this country. A series of scandals are taking place in this country. Of course, the Congress Party has done a good job by suspending somebody, by expelling him from the primary membership of the Party, but it is something amazing to find four crores of rupees in one small room. It is four crores of rupees! When we had stalled the Parliament for hardly fifteen days in December, 1995, we were then dubbed by everybody that we were wasting the time of the Parliament. What the Opposition Parties including my party, Mr. Biplab Dasgupta's party of Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta's party or Mrs. Kamla Sinha's Janata Dal were saying in 1995 has now been completely vindicated whereby four crores of rupees have been seized in cash at one point of time! Had there been a seizure in december, 1995, instead of four crores of rupees, there would have been four hundred crores of rupees. The Congress has taken the right decision. They have suspended him from the Parliamentary Party, they have expelled him from the primary membership of the party. That may bring a bad name to the Congress Party now, but such type of people bring a bad name to all of us, to the whole political institution. So, you have to do somethig in this behalf.

Lastly, Sir, in this connection, I would like to refer to one case. When there was a case or bribery of Rs. 2,000 alleged by somebody, what was the response of the then Prime Minister in the Parliament? It is the famous Mudgal case. On 6th June, 1951 the then Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, moved a motion against Mr. H.G. Mudgal. Mr. T.T. Krishnamachari was the Chairman of the Committee. The matter was investigated. It was found that Mr. Mudgal, the then Member of Parliament, accepted Rs. 2,000 as bribe for raising certain questions and for gettig certain appointments with the Ministers concerned and he was expelled from the membership of this House for that. I have got many more cases here. There is a case of Tulmohan Ram which relates to the licence scandal. There may be some other cases also. I don't want to refer to them. I want to refer only to one case, which I referred to here, in brief. A time has come when the size of the tap is not to be increased by mobilising more resources from FDI or from direct taxes or from indirect taxes, by taxing the pauper, by collecting the cess. How are you appropriating that tax money? How are you dealing with that cess money? The tap size may be of the same size. Please plug the loopholes, pilferages and leakages on account of corruption in the whole system. The recent seizure is only a symptom of the whole disease, how deep it has gone into the system. I am sorry to say that we will have to address ourselves to this system. The Finance Minister has miserably failed to address himself to the question of eradication of corruption which is eating into the vitals of this country. This is the point which we have to address ourselves to rising above party-lines and political considerations, whosoever he may be, he may be in my party or he may be in your party. It is a difference of percentages. That is all. That is how the whole political institution is getting discredited. That is the main challenge before the Parliament. How does the Parliament respond to such corrupt people? I have read in the newspapers that you are having a formula of 50:50. If four crores of rupees have been seized, according to income-tax law, two crores of rupees will go to him and two crores of rupees will go to the exchequer.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: It is 60:40.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Why? This 60:40 formula under the income-tax law is applicable to a person who earns money but not disclosed it. It is hard-earned money. But he does not disclose it. He evades tax. But this is not an undisclosed income or hard-earned money of an assessee. It is an ill-gotten money under the Prevention of Corruption Act. I demand of this House that if there is no law, let us enact a law to confiscate the properties of all those people who are charged under the corruption law, whether he is "A" or whether he is "B" or whether he is "C". All the properties of the persons or politicians or Ministers or MPs, who are charged or convicted under the Prevention of Corruption Act, should be confiscated and given to the treasury. That should be the law and not making the income-tax law applicable to him.

With these words I thank the House for giving a patient hearing. Thank you very much.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I was listening to Mr. Satish Agarwal since yesterday. I find that many of the areas of the Budget proposals for the year 1996-97 have been covered by him in his own way. I would like to confine myself to some of the basic issues of the Budget for the year 1996-97. When a Finance Minister presents the Budget it is not that he presents the Budget in vacuum. He presents the Budget in the context of certain factors. When the present Finance Minister formulated his proposals and presented the Budget for the year 1996-97 he had before him the Common Minimum Programme of the United Front Government, he had before him the state of economy as he inherited from the day of his assumption of office and he had before him the national priorities determined in the Plan document of the Eighth Five Year Plan for which the year 1996-97 is the terminal year.

3.00 P.M.

In that context the Finance Minister had to formulate his proposals, had to balance the accounts and also had to indicate certain basic objectives which the United Front Government has before it. In the language of the Finance Minister himself, while formulating the budget proposals and balancing the accounts, he set before him certain priorities, like containing fiscal deficit, maintaining price stability, conveying prompt signals for the continuity of economic reforms policy, to step up developmental expenditure and to provide necessary support for maintaining sustaniable growth in the fiscal and social infrastructure These were his priorities. In addition to that, he also initiated and made certain proposals in regard to certain policies which have been enuciated in the Common Minimum Programme like fiscal federalism. That is the phrase which they have used in the Common Minimum Programme. Thereafter, in the Planning Commission documents they have indicated cooperative federalism. I will come to that aspect a little later.

First of all, I would like to look into certain aspects of revenues. Here I would like to get myself clarified by the Finance Minister because I find certain anomalies in his projections and what the normal trend is. As we all know, Income Tax. Corporation Tax, Central Excise and Customs Duties, these four taxes, constitute nearly 97.5 per cent of the Central Gvoernment revenues. If we look at the Budget at a Glance, there is a 14.4 per cent step-up in the Central Excise revenue. The Central Excise revenue was Rs. 42,780 crores in the year 1995-96 Budget Estimates. As per these doucments, there was less realisation. At the Revised Estimate stage, it was Rs. 41,000 crores. That means from Rs. 42,780 crores, it has come down to Rs. 41,000 crores. So the difference is Rs. 1,780 crores. His projection for the year 1996-97 is Rs. 46,884 crores. If I make a comparison between BE and RE, the growth is 14.4 per cent. But what is actually happening? In the year 1995-96, from BE to RE it has come down from Rs. 42,780 crores to Rs. 41,000 crores. He is projecting a growth of 14.4 per cent from the Excise Duty. That means in 1996-97 it would be Rs. 46,884 crores. What is the normal calculation in elasticity of Excise Duty? The normal assessment is that 1 percent growth in industry yields 0.8 per cent excise Revenue with one per cent industrial growth there is 0.8 per cent Excise revenue growth. The industrial growth is being projected around 12 per Cent. If you assume 12 per cent industrial growth, then the normal revenue yielding should be around 10 per cent. at the ratio of 0.8 per cent; one percent Therefore taking this into account, according to my assessment, the excise revenue realisation would be Rs. 1800 crores less than what has been projected. Now let me turn around to customs duty.

In 1994-95, the customs duty was Rs. 29,500 crores—the Budget Estimates stage. In the Revised Estimates, it went up to Rs. 35,352 crores. The growth is about 32 per cent. The Finance Minister has taken Rs. 44,435 crores. For the year 1996-97, there would be a growth of 27 per cent. Here, too, I have some doubts. Why do I have these doubts? I have doubts both in the case of excise duty and in the case of customs duty. If we look at the growth of customs duty, in 1995-96, as per the Revised Estimates, it was 32 per cent. Only two items accounted for near half of the total increase of Rs. 5,285 crores. These two items are petroleum

products and vegetable oil. We got additional customs duty on petroleum products to the extent of Rs. 2100 crores and on vegetable oil, it was Rs. 487 crores. Surely, everybody is aware of the fact that the petroleum crude production, in the year 1995-96, went below the targetted level. That cannot be repeated every year. In that case there will be other problems. Therefore, to my mind, here also there is over-estimation. According to my calculations, a 12 per cent industrial growth will require import entitlements in terms of capital goods, in terms of raw materials and in terms of intermediaries around 22 percent. There cannot be a higher growth beyond 20 to 22 per cent. Why am I quoting these figures? I am doing this only to point out that his contention is to contain the fiscal deficit at five per cent of the GDP. He has said that the fiscal deficit would be Rs. 62,266 crores—five per cent of the GDP. Every year and I am not excluding the years when we were in the Government, you will find that there has been some variation between RE and BE. Therefore, one should not try to compare the Revised Estimates with the Budget Estimates. Exactly, this has been done. He has compared Rs. 64,010 crores with the Revised Estimates of 1995-96 of Rs. 62,266 crores. The comparable figure should have been Rs. 57,736 crores which was the Budget estimate. My contention is that while computing the fiscal deficit, there is inflation on the receipts side and there is depression on the expenditure side.

Another area is the miscellaneous receipts like non-Govt. P.F., Gratuity Funds etc. You have Taken credit for the miscellaneous receipts which is to the extent of Rs. 9,548 crores. You have projected a growth of 10.4 per cent for the year 1996-97 which is not possible. In 1991—95, in these four years, the annual average growth has been about 6 per cent. There is no reason to believe that miscellaneous receipts will suddenly jump to Rs. 9,548 crores. As per my estimation, here also there is over-estimation of Rs. 400 to Rs. 500 crores.

There is another element on the receipts side which is disinvestment. You have taken and credit of Rs. 5000 crores. What are the receipts for the year 1995-96?

We took credit to the extent of Rs. 5,000 crores. I think that at the end of the year, we can realise Rs. 357 crores. Assuming that instead of Rs. 357 crores that we can get, we get, Rs. 1,000 crores, it means that we will have less receipts of almost Rs. 4,000 crores. Therefore, as per my calculation, what I find is that on the receipt side, there has been an inflated figure of about Rs. 1,800 crores on excise duties, about Rs. 1,100 crores on customs duties, about Rs. 4,000 crores on disinvestment, about Rs. 400 crores on miscellaneous receipts and another Rs. 2,500 crores which you had taken towards licence fee for the telecoms. Now in cellular and certain other areas, you have already received Rs. 1,800 crores. The market is already saturated and I don't expect that you can have more than Rs. 1,500 to Rs. 1,600 crores. There again, there will be a shortfall of about Rs. 1,000 crores. As per my calculation, an amount of almost Rs. 8,800 crores which has been projected on the receipt side may not be possible to be realised. I am stating these figures only to draw the attention of the Finance Minister. I will be too happy if I am proved wrong and if these amounts of resources are made available so that at least the fiscal deficit will be continued at 5 per cent. Now let us see how the expenditure on certain items has been depressed.

Coming to defence expenditure, we have projected a growth of 3.4 per cent. During the last five years, we had been able to contain the defence expenditure; I am not talking in terms of percentage of GDP—(in terms of percentage of GDP, it is coming down)—but I am talking in terms of Budgetary transations. In terms of Budgetary transactions, the growth is eight to ten per cent. At least, you will have to allow for the rate of inflation. Last year, it was 15 per cent. And this year we are simply projecting the growth at 3.4 per cent. I don't think that it is to contain defence expenditure at Rs. 27,928 crore. An additional amount of possible with the amount of Rs. 2,500 not less than Rs. 3,000 crores will be required to step up defence expenditure from present level. One figure is totally mind-boggling to me, namely, the reduction of debt-servicing to the extent of Rs. 2,000 crores. How can you achieve the reduction of debt-servicing to the extent of

Rs. 2,000 crores? Every year, in terms of percentage, debt-servicing is increasing, and it is bound to increase because you will have to depend more and more on borrowings, resource mobilisation through borrowings. I will come to that figure a little later. But where are own resources? Mr. Agarwal has very elaborately dealt with the subject of our debt-burden. It is true and for that we need not go into any other document. This very simple document indicates that the entire revenue receipts for the current year is Rs. 1,30,000 crores—I am giving you the round figure—and debt-servicing and principal repayment taken together is Rs. 1,28,000 crores. In other words, without borrowing any money, if we simply want to meet our debt-servicing in terms of principal and interest repayment, the whole Government of India will be left with only Rs. 2,000 crores which is not enough even to meet the requirements of one D.A. instalment. Therefore, this is the reality, If we take this expenditure depression and receipt inflation into account, I am afraid, as per my caluclation, 13,900 crores of rupees would be the additional deficit leading to a fiscal deficit of not five per cent with GDP growth of 6.3 per cent. I am taking the CSO projected growth of 6.3 per cent. I am not assuming 7per cent. Also in the Finance Minister's calculation, in many places we will find that he has taken 14-15 per cent growth in nominal terms as he himself has assumed that 8.4 per cent would be the average annual rate of inflation and 6.3 per cent would be the GDP growth; taken together, 15 to 16 per cent Growth in nominal terms. Therefore, I am afraid with this 6.3 per cent growth your fiscal deficit cannot be less than 6 or 6.1 per cent. That is the first point that I thought I should bring to your notice. The second point is this. Here I must compliment the Government and this trend has started for quite sometime and both in 1995-96 and 1994-95 it has been projected and this is a good sign. We should continue it. In the last two years what has been the characteristic of the enhancement on revenue and enhancement on expenditure? On the enhancement of revenue, we find that in 1994-95, of the total receipts, Government's revenue receipts were 53 per cent and the capital receipts were 47 per cent. In 1995-96 Revenue receipts increased and when I talk of revenue receipts, I take both tax revenues and non-tax revenues. It went up to 62.8 per cent and correspondingly the capital receipts came down to 37.2 per cent. In 1996-97, the Finance Minister has also projected a little higher figure and I think if we can stick to that it would be welcome—65.8 and 34.2. That means it would be less borrowing. But the disturbing sign is on the expenditure pattern which is emerging. Non-Plan expenditure in 1994-95 was 70.5 per cent, Plan expenditure was 29.5 per cent. There has been further deterioration. In the revised stage, it went up to 73.4 per cent and correspondingly the plan expenditure came down to 26.6 per cent. In the Budget Estimates for the year 1996-97, the Finance Minister has kept the same ratio. Therefore, the situation with which we are confronted today is about Debts. There is no denying the fact. In the morning we were having discussions about the external debt whether it is 93 billion or 99 billion, whatever it may be. That does not matter much but a substantial quantum of external debt is there and internal debt, as I have given you the figures, is enough to take care of one year's entire revenue receipts. But what is to be done? Here comes the question of taking a collective effort. The Finance Minister has made out a proposal in his Budget Speech. He is talking of the expenditure Commission. When my friend Mr. Satish Agarwal was Minister of Revenue and Expenditure in the first Janata Party Government in 1977—79, I think in the second Budget of Mr. H.M Patel a propsal of Expenditure Commission was mooted. But it was a non-starter because the Government collapsed. I made some exercise as Deputy Chairman of Planning Commission by appointing a committee under Shri Biju Patnaik which was known as the Austerity Committee. It consisted of six Chief Ministers including the Chief Minister of all non-Congress political parties at that time.

They came out with a recommendation. Their recommendation was placed before the NDC. The NDC gave me a direction as the then Deputy Chairman that we could not take a decision and that it was a decision which should be taken at the highest political level. It asked me to take it up with the Central trade union organisations of the country and all the major

political parties. We took it up, but there was no consensus. In a way, Mr. Agarwal is correct when he pointed out that subsidies are coming down in terms of percentage. It is true. Subsidy as a percentage of the GDP was 1.8% in 1990-91, 1.6% in 1991-92. It came down to 1.3% in 1992-93. It remained at the same level in 1993-94 also. It was 1.2% in 1994-95. It was 1.1% in 1995-96. Regarding 1996-97, we have yet to calculate. The decrease is in terms of percentage of GDP but not in absolute terms. In absolute terms, it is increasing. Let it increase in absolute terms. But subsidies have come down in terms of percentage of GDP. It does not help us in three crucial sectors—road transport, State Electricity Boards and State Irrigation Boards. In these sectors, we are creating assets. But the service charges that we are collecting from the users, from the beneficiaries, I am sorry to say, are not enough even to maintain the assets which have been created. Under which carpet can we keep them? Surely resources are not coming from heaven. We are talking about the debt burden. Yes, it is true. And resources have to be generated to retire the debt. I and Mr. Agarwal are very good friends. But I strongly oppose his contention that customs duties and corporation tax should be brought under the divisible pool. Why I oppose, I will explain a little later. In the Eighth Five Year Plan, the States' total Plan outlay—I am excluding the Union Territories—is Rs. 1,79,985 crores. This amount covers 10 special category States and 15 non-special category States. Of this, the Central assistance is Rs. 78,000 crores. When the Plan was formulated for funding state plans, it was thought that contributions from BCR (Balance from Current Revenue) from the States would be Rs. 10,591 crores over a period of five years. It means that BCR contribution from the States would be about Rs. 2,000 crores every year. What was the outcome at the end of four years? Instead of any positive contribution, from all the States taken together it is minus Rs. 3,276 crores. From an estimated positive contribution of Rs. 10,591 crores, it is minus Rs. 3,276 crores. What about the contributions from the State public sector units? We knew that the State Electricity Boards, the Road Transport Corporations and the State Irrigation Boards would not be able to generate positive resources, plus figures. Then you add the negative contributions of these State public sector enterprises at the level of minus Rs. 5,096 crores. Ultimately at the end of the year, we are finding that there has been some improvement in the sense that intead of minus Rs. 5,096 crores, it has become minus Rs. 1,000 odd crores.

But for funding the Plan, substantial part of the state's resources are coming from small savings. What are small savings? Small savings are nothing but borrowing. As a result of this, there has been a serious distortion in the developmental expenditure. If we look at the 8th Five Year Plan, four years have passed. This year, the Central budgetary support to the Plan, both for Central Plan and the State Plan taken together, has increased from Rs. 48,500 crores to more than Rs. 54,000 crores. It is a step-up of about 13%, which is good. But, at the same time, the hard-core fact is that as per the actuals in the first four years—the actuals mean those including the Revised Estimate of 1995-96; the actual figure is not available, so it is the projected figure for 1996-97 on the basis of figures for the year 1995-96 because the Planning Commission could not make new allocations for the current financial year, it had to depend upon a step-up of 10% on the basis of 1995-96 figures; so, taking all these together—the States Plan would not be more than 35%. In other words, if you look at the macro-level, the new investible resources available were Rs. 7,98,000 crores and during the 8th Plan Rs. 4,37,000 crores were earmarked for the private and household sector. Rs. 3,61,000 crores were available for the public sector—Central, State and the Union Territories. In that, you add Rs. 73,100 crores, which was the current outlay. This led to the figure of Rs. 4,34,100 crores, of which the States' share was Rs. 1,79,985 crores. The Union Territories' share was Rs. 6,250 crores and the Central sector had Rs. 2,47,000 crores and odd. I am not talking in real terms. I am not talking on the basis of the price-level of 1991-92. Even in nominal terms, the States in aggregate would not be able to reach the Plan target of 35%, whereas their share, excluding the Union Territories, was 41.5%. How should

the development take place? It is not merely the words that are going to help us. But we shall have to take certain hard decisions. What will the Expenditure Commission do? It will come out with very good suggestions. It will make beautiful recommendations. But who is going to bell the cat? Who is going to implement those recommendations? What happened in the morning? I am sorry to say it because when I speak it is not merely to score a personal point. For every minute of Parliament session, we spend Rs. 4,763. In the year 1990-91, the total expenditure of the Parliament was Rs. 30.26 crores. In 1995-96, it went up to Rs. 79.70 crores. And what has been the productive outcome? My colleagues may differ with me, but this is the hard-cold fact. He was referring to the deficit of one crore of rupees in the second Budget of India in 1948. Yes, it is natural because, you will recollect, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in the first Budget of independent India presented by Shri Shanmukham Chetty on 15th November 1947, the total budgetary transaction was Rs. 293 crores—Rs. 191 crores on account of Defence Budget and Rs. 91 crores on account of, what was then called, the Civil Budget. So, one crore of rupees in an overall transaction of Rs. 293 crores is quite big. Today, we are having a budgetary transaction of Rs. 2,04,000 crores. But how much time this Parliament is giving to Budget Discussion?

From 1951 to 1956, during the term of the First Lok Sabha, 68 per cent of the total time of Parliament was devoted to discussing Budget, financial matters and Bills. In the Ninth Lok Sabha—Tenth Lok Sabha figures are yet to be made available--only 38 per cent of the total time of parliament was devoted for the entire legislative and financial business. Therefore, it is high time that we should think over it. It will not help if we simply make our observations and thereafter leave everything to the bureaucracy and civil servants. We have built a beautiful institution. You were talking of some of the structures of the Budget. Quite a number of these recommendations had been made in the Estimates Committee of 1986-87. From 1951 onwards, it was the practice to implement the recommendations of the Estimates Committee in the structure of the Budget, but we shall have to check whether it has been done or not. For that we require time. We want to have an atmosphere of a structured debate. If we have a structured, informed and an orderly debate, then each and every one of us can make our points. But, I don't know how we can achieve that. I am pretty old in this House. When I first came in 1969--I am telling you very frankly, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir,--there was no Zero Hour; there was no Special Mention, but everyday we used to have Calling Attention. We could have a structured discussion on known subjects--today I don't know what my colleague is going to raise. I am sorry, I have digressed a little, but the point I am trying to drive home is that with the complexity of the administration, Parliament should devote more time on structured and informed debates, particularly on financial matters. We are not doing so. As a result of it, serious derelictions on some occasions are taking place. Therefore, merely having an Expenditure Commission is not enough. There is need for a strong political will and from where that strong political will can come? I am sorry, if we leave it to the State Assemblies, it will never come. It is only possible for the Federal Parliament, Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, political parties at the national level to take the decision, take courage in both hands and try to do it; otherwise, it is impossible. In the Chief Ministers' Conference we took a decision that there should be fifty paise per unit power charge...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: On agriculture.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: And most of the Chief Ministers agreed. It was the decision of that Conference. In fact, all of them agreed. The first thing they did after going back to their capitals was to denounce this decision. There cannot be a situation where they can go on distributing the non-existing resources. This is one area to which, I feel, nobody but the Federal Parliament will have to address itself. A country cannot live on borrowing externally; a Government cannot live on borrowing internally for all times to come. Yes, I am owning the responsibility myself--the point which Shri Agarwal was elaborating, being in the Government, being Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission--I pointed out that to utilise the resources generated out of the dis-

investment for normal revenue consumption is nothing but disposing of the family silver to meet the normal consumption expenditure. But, unfortunately, a situation was there then. Nothing can be done unless we take a collective decision here. Mere appointment of a commission is not going to help.

There is another issue about which I would like to know from the hon. Finance Minister. He has made an allocation of eight hundred crores of rupees for major irrigation projects. What does he mean by major irrigation projects, whether it is in terms of money or in terms of coverage or in terms of importance? I do not know whether he is aware of the background of funding irrigation projects from centre.

You will recollect, before the Gadgil formula on Central Plan assistance was introduced in 1969, there was no structure or formula to provide Plan assistance to States. For the first time, the then Deputy Chairman and economist, Shri Gadgil, came out with a formula and in that formula there was a component of 10% to be provided to the nationally important power and irrigation projects. 60% was on the basis of population, 10% on the basis of per capita income, 10% on the basis of tax efforts,10% on the basis of special problems and 10% on the basis of nationally important power and irrigation projects. In 1980, the State Chief Ministers raised objection to this component of the formula in the National Development Council: They asked: "Why should we have it? You are asking us to pay from our divisible kitty from which we could get a share to fund a project for which beneficiaries are just three, four or five States. Why "Non-beneficiaries should be affected?"

At that time there were not 25 States. Today they are 25. They also raised the issue "Irrigation and power are basically State subjects. Why are you going to have that?"

Now you are giving Rs. 800 crores. Even if you look at the projects which will cost about a thousand crores of rupees, this Rs. 800 crores will be a paltry sum. If you spread the resources evenly, it will not help anybody. My own experience is of the Sardar Sarovar Project. We started it from the late 1950's. In the first meeting of the National Development Council, the then Chief Minister of Rajasthan, as also the present Chief Minister, asked me, "How do you expect to complete this project where you are creating a new Ganga by taking the Himalayan waters to the desert of Barmer covering 1500 Kms.? The amount you are providing is just Rs. 10 crores, Rs. 12 crores. When would it be completed?" I accepted his suggestion and then I told him, "I am prepared to give you as much money as you will give it." He said, "I am prepared to give Rs. 50 crores." From the Planning Commission, we gave him a matching of Rs. 50 crores. What is happening today? If you just go to one district in that area you will see. Last year, the turnover of the sale of cotton and certain other important products was Rs. 1500 crores! Therefore, we shall have to take certain measures. But you cannot have it in this way. If you want to bring it as a regular part of the kitty, you do it and make it conditional.Because States have their own priorities. Unless you change the formula this type of *ad hoc* arrangement whereby today you give Rs. 800 crores, somebodyelse comes and gives Rs. 1200 crores, is not going to help. We shall have to decide on what we want. The resources are not unlimited. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am sorry that I am taking a little more time. I think, my party will be a little indulgent with me. You give me some more time.

Take the case of direct taxes which are non-inflationary like income-tax and corporation tax. What has been the statistics? In 1991 it was one per cent, both corporation tax and income-tax. It is one per cent of the GDP. In 1991-92 it was 1.1 and 1.3.

SHRI AJIT P.K JOGI: None of the Ministers is taking any notes. (*Interruptions*)

नागर विमानन मंत्री तथा सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री सी.एम. इब्राहिम): इतनी अच्छी बात कर रहे हैं। आप बीच में मत बोलिए। जो बात वह कह रहे हैं उस पर ही गुफ्तगू चल रही है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I would like to make a mention. Please take it seriously. We are very few in number. If one starts whispering, it goes on echoing and echoing. It disturbs those who want to listen carefully, particularly if the speech is supported with statistics. I think, we will have to keep that in view.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: What is the share of the taxes? Particularly I am talking of the non-inflationary taxes. Direct Taxes, Income Tax, Corporation Tax, etc., are non-inflationary in nature. You look at the figures. In 1990-91, it was 1 per cent; in 1991-92, it was 1.1 and 1.3; 1992-93—I am talking of Income Tax and the Corporation Tax—1.1 and 1.3; 1993-94, it was 1.1 and 1.3; 1994-95, it was 1.4 and 1.5 and 1995-96, it was 1.4 and 1.5. We are claiming that we are having the largest number of the middle class and yesterday Mr. Agarwal said it is almost equal to that of Central Europe. And where does this middle class stand? They do not pay taxes. Your total number of taxpayers in this country is not more than seven million. Even if I assume that they represent five members of a family, it will be 35 million—seven multiplied by five. Where are these 200 million middle class people? What is the exchequer getting from them? This is one area where I do not recommend to you that you raise the tax vertically. But, surely it can be horizontal expansion. I do not believe that in this country today only 7 million people and able to pay direct taxes and the rest are not able to pay. I do not subscribe to that view. There are more people who should pay tax. Now the question is of fiscal federalism what is the concept of this fiscal federalism? What do we want to achieve by it? More devolution to the States? More transfer of resources to the States? let us look at it. The Sarkaria Commission was appointed and it came out with its report. They have taken into account the compound growth of the State taxes and the compound growth of Union taxes. And what has been the finding? From 1974-75 to 1984-85 the compound growth of the State taxes and the compound growth of the Union taxes were at par—Centre taxes 14.0 per cent and State taxes 15.5 per cent. Therefore, it is not a sustainable thesis that the State taxes have no less revenue yielding capacity and that the State taxes are less elastic compared to the Central taxes because over a period of 34 years, the compound growth rate is arround 13 per cent. There has been a talk and somebody has suggested as to why the Finance Commission cannot take note of these facts and why they cannot come out with a fresh devolution formula. I would like to draw your attention how the Finance Commissions have stepped up devolution to meet the requirements of the States from one Finance Commission to another Finance Commission. The First Finance Commission—I am talking of Excise Duty—recommended that 40 per cent of the Union Excise Duty will be distributed amongst the States only on three items, namely, tobacco, matches and vegetable products. The Second Finance Commission enlarged that basket and included sugar, tea, coffee, paper, vegetables for essential oils. But, they reduced the share of percentage, from 40 per cent to 20 per cent. The Fourth Finance Commission considered the demand of the States for share of Excise Duty on all commodities as perfectly reasonable and allotted 20 per cent. The Fifth Finance Commission went a step further and recommended that the States should also receive a share from the proceeds of the Special Excise Duty and that was made available from 1972-73.

The Sixth Finance Commission recommended that the levy on excise duty not shareable with the States should be continued for a short period of two to three years. In view of this, the Finance Commission recommended that the States share should be 20% of all basic excise duties and it further recommended 20% of the net proceeds of the auxiliary excise duty to be shared from 1976-77. The Seventh Finance Commission stepped it up from 20% to 40%. The Eighth Finance Commission stepped it up to 45% and now it is 45%. Another variation has been brought, that of this 45%, 5% is being used for giving the States grants-in-aid, under Article 275 of the Constitution. Therefore, it is not correct to say that the Finance Commission is not taking note of it.

In the case of Income-tax, the First Finance Commission recommended 54.5%; the Second Finance Commission recommended 60%; the Third Finance Commission recommended 62.5%, the Fourth Finance Commission recommended 75%, the Fifth Finance Commission recommended 75%; the Sixth Finance Commission recommended 80% and thereafter it is 85%. About debt liabilities of the States, both the Ninth Finance Commisson and the Tenth Finance Commissions have made recommendations. My contention is not to deprive the States. My contention is that by

mere distribution or mere bringing of more items within the divisible pool is not going to resolve the issue, unless serious efforts are made to mop up the resources which are available. I do agree that there has been a structural change and that clue is available from the Sarkaria Commission's Report and the latest reports of the State Finances. In the year 1951-52, the First Plan started I will take only two items which contributed substantially to the State exchequer, one was taxes on Land and the other was Sales Tax. All of us know that the Sales Tax was introduced in the year 1937 by Shri Rajagopalachari, the then Premier of undivided Madras Presidency. Since then, Sales Tax continued to be a major item in the States' taxes. In the year 1951-52 taxes levied on two items—land and sales of goods constituted 47 per cent of the total taxes of the State—21% on land and 26% on sales tax. In 1984-85 the contribution of taxes on land has come down from 21% to 2% and contribution of sales tax has increased from 26% to 57%. I am not recommending any particular mode of taxes. I am showing the variations over the years. Similarly, intersectoral changes have taken place in the union taxes. The contribution of Income-tax, in the first years of our Plan, was 28.5%. The contribution of Excise Duty with the lower level of industrial growth was just 17%. And today, as I mentioned to you, Income-tax, Corporation Tax, Central Excise and Customs Duty contribute about 97.5% and in that contribution, Excise Duty alone is 47%. Fortunately for the last 2 years the contribution of direct taxes has increased from 8% to 13% but it came down from 28% to 8%. The point which I am trying to underline is it is not merely a question that there has been any great injustice in the distribution of the resources.

It is not that. Now what about unlimited borrowings? We have taken care of that. Today, what is the pattern of the market borrowings?

The overall ceiling is fixed by the Finance Minister at the yearly level, at the annual level. The Central Government is not taking anything from it, from the market borrowings. The entire thing is being passed on to the States. Another example, realisation from small savings—75 per cent goes to the States. All these things, by whatever name you call it—Market borrowings, State Provided Fund, Small Savings, etc.—are borrowings. Borrowed money is coming.

I do sympathise with Mr. Agarwal when he asks; 'Why is the Government paying only 7-8 per cent to the depositor?' It is true. But the point is, how to fund the plan? From where resources at less cost will come? You cannot have the cake and, at the same time, eat it too. These low cost resources are used for plan. We have reduced the share of SLR.

Earlier, it used to be 36-37 per cent of the SLR. We decided, after the Narasimham Committee Report, that the directional credit of the banks would have to be reduced. You are reducing SLR from 36-37 per cent to 25 per cent. You are trying, to achieve that. Therefore, wherefrom the resources are to come? If you give them at the market rate, the only thing which would happen is that the interest liability of the Government would increase; nothing else would happen. It will not generate any new resource. It will only be a transfer of resource from one area to another area. It would further make the development more costly.

Therefore, the ultimate solution, to my mind, is to generate more resources at less cost, to enhance Government's resources—not borrowed resources. What formula can you adopt? What new items can you bring under the divisible pool? Ultimately, a decision has to be taken by us if we want to avoid a serious fiscal mismanagement. Year after year, we are trying to keep it under carpet. As I mentioned, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not want to pass on the buck to anybody. All are responsible. We are prepared to accept the major responsibility. At the same time, this issue has to be addressed. If the fiscal deficit is to be contained, if the non-development expenditure is to be contained, there is no way out but to take some strong measures. For that purpose, enough recomendations are available to the Government.

I now come to my last point. This is about the general directions of the Budget which the Finance Minister wanted to have. Expenditure control, I have already referred to. Now, about price control. I do feel that the strict money policy, the dear money policy, should continue for some time. At the same time, the Government will have to look into it, if we want to be competitive, with the opening up of the

economy, with the globalisation of the economy. I am not going into other aspects of the banking sector about which the previous speaker, Mr. Satish Agarwal, had pointed out.

There is one point in regard to the banking sector to which I take a very strong objection. It is: the banks have a tendency of creating non-productive assets. This should be strictly avoided. The Banks must improve its operational effeciency so that the profit of banks enhance. Otherwise, you cannot reduce the interest rates. If you cannot reduce the interest rates, merely by exchange adjustment, you cannot give a real thrust to your export efforts. The export efforts have to be promoted by quality credit and institutional inputs. Credit should be timely. It should be at competitive rates. What type of protection we can give to our exporters and industry? Sometimes we think that we can give them protection either by putting imports on the banned list, or, we can have exorbitant import tariff. But nothing is available under today's dispensation. You cannot just go on fighting like Don Quixote on every front. The ground reality has to be recognised.

Therefore, it is highly necessary that we must do something about the interest rates. Otherwise, with this exorbitant interest rates we cannot be competitive. I know. I understand the dilemma of the Government. If the Government is to continue the dear money policy to contain the supply of M-3, they would have to have some sort of a disincentive for utilising the bank credit. At the same time, if we want to encourage the Indian entrepreneurs and the Indian exporters to be competitive at the global level, there must be quality credit, both in terms of availability in time and in terms of the interest rate.

Otherwise it would be extremely difficult. In this connection, perhaps, the time has come to have a fresh look into the credit requirement of the rural sector. We made some exercise but it is almost 20 years old. But I am sorry to admit that the expectation with which we began to institutionalise the rural credit in 1975 has not been fulfilled. On 2nd October 1975, we started the Regional Rural Banks on the birthday of Mahatma Gandhi. At that point of time, according to a study conducted by the Reserve Bank and a study conducted by the then Additional Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, Shri Narasimhan, who later on became the Governor of Reserve Bank of India, nearly two-thirds of the credit requirement of the rural area came from the non-institutional money lenders' sector. We thought of substituting it through the institutional arrangement and the Regional Rural Banks were established. It was made quite clear at the initial stage that these are not just rural branches of the commercial banks. The point should be understood because it has lost sight today. These were not branches of the commercial banks in the rural areas. But these are new institutions which were owned by the State Government, which were owned by a sponsoring bank and the ownership pattern was one-third, one-third, one-third by share by State Govt. sponsoring Bank and RBI respectively. They should meet the requirement of the rural area. It was like in the phraseology of those days 'bare-foot bankers' so that they can meet the requirements of the rural population and the procedures should be simple. Physical expansion has taken place. But unfortunately, we failed to create the motivation starting, from the employees to the management of the Regional Rural Banks. They just thought that it was nothing but the extension of the commercial banks in the rural sector and the whole objective had been lost sight of. On the other hand, in other developing countries also the name is the same—Gramin Bank, they succeeded. In Bangladesh the experiment is extremely satisfactory; in Philippins the experiment is extremely satisfactory. As a result, when institutional credit becomes costly and non-available, the growth of non-institutional or non-recognised institutional arrangement will come, and it is coming. Quite a number of people are becoming victims of unscrupulous elements of this type. Therefore, to my mind, once again after 20 years, there is need to look into the institutional credit requirement of the rural area. There is a talk of merging the Regional Rural Banks with other banks. I am not going into the aspect. But it is frankly to be admitted regarding the purpose for which these institutions were created had not been fulfilled. They were not allowed to go to that level and they were simply diverted and they were led towards other directions. There

is need for looking into these aspects. In conclusion, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Finance Minister could not be expected to do anything dramatic and I am happy that he did not make any attempt to do anything dramatic because he could not give a contrary signal; he could not deny the gains at the macro-economic level. Nobody can deny the hard cold facts whatever has been the achievement, for the last 45 years, is a matter of individual perception. When Mr. Agarwal was quoting the GNP figures, he simply forgot one very basic point: when we take into account the per capita figures, we should not forget that in 1947 we had a population of more than 350 million but now we are more than 900 million, which has a relevance so far as per capita figures are concerned. On the whole the macro-economic indicators are quite encouraging and this is to be kept up. We cannot allow a fall in the growth. There are problems. There are concommitant problems. But whom are we trying to befool? Yes, from 1951 to 1979, that is from the First Plan to the Fifth plan what was the growth rate?

4.00 P.M.

It was 3.5 per cent. Our GDP grew at the rate of 3.5 per cent which Prof. Rajadhyaksha described as Hindu growth rate. In the whole of the 80's, we kept a higher growth rate of 5.8 per cent and, after the 5.8 per cent GDP growth rate, we did not have the resources. We had to borrow and today, when the debate is going on investment from abroad, the choice is very clear. Through which route would you like to go? Would you like to go through the borrowal route, which we did? This is my last point, Mr. Vice-Chairman. If you want to achieve, say, a seven per cent growth rate, which we actually achieved during the year 1995-96, our rate of investment should be around 28 per cent of the GDP. As you mean the incremental capital output ratio is 4.1, you rate of savings is around 24, 23, though in the Planning Commission we assumed 21.6 per cent including dissavings of the public sector. The three sectors are the household sector, Government sector and private corporate sector. Through the private corporation sector, the contribution is just two per cent of the GDP. Household sector is the main contributor. I can expand from 21.6 to 23, 24, 25, but if I want 30 per cent growth, from where will I have the balance? We have two routes. One is the borrowal route. And what is the implication of the borrowal route? What we found is that in 1990-91 our current account deficit, as reflected in the GDP, went up as high as 3.5 per cent. It is not a very small achievement. In our anxiety we should not forget that from a 3.5 per cent current account deficit, we had been able to bring it down to less than one per cent, 0.6, 0.8, for the last two years and this year it is expected to be 1.6 per cent. These are the achievements. And nothing should be done to disrupt these achievements. Therefore, instead of going through the borrowal route, what we feel is this It is absolutely relevant. I welcome it when the Finance Minister says or the Common Minimum Programme says, that we should attract 10 billion US dollars. Yes, we want 10 billion US dollars. Even if we cannot have 10 billion US dollars, let us have five billion dollars per year so that we can bridge the gap of the investment requirement. To my mind, if we want to double our GNP by the next 10 years —I am not going to many other areas—but pointing to two major objectives to which we are already committed are "Education for All" and "Jobs for All". In other words, to create 10 million jobs a year to achieve a near-full employment scenario by the next 9 to 10 years, our growth should not be less than eight to ten per cent. In order to achieve that growth, our investment in terms of GDP should not be less than 30 to 32 per cent.

From where will these resources come? If economists can come out with the idea, "Yes, we can raise our domestic savings to 27, 28", welcome. But nobody has come out. From 21 somebody may say 23, 24. That is the maximum. Therefore, the option left to us is either to satisfy ourselves with a lower level of growth or to go through the other route—not through the borrowal route but through the direct investment route, which is welcome.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (WEST BENGAL): May I ask a question? The investment ratio had been falling during the last five years. Last year, suddenly there was a jump-up from 21 per cent to something like 24 per cent. Is it possible for investment to come down for five years and then suddenly jump up?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Two things you have to look into. Firstly, when we talk of it, we make certain adjustments with the CSO's figures. But it is possible to have that sudden growth because, even if you look at 1986-87 to 1987-88, in one year we had a sudden growth of almost three percentage points more, i.e. 10 per cent - I am talking of the GDP growth. So far as the rate of growth is concerned, my calculation is very simple. I take the average rate of investment 4.1 and I am dividing the total investment by I.C.O.R. (incremental capital output ratio) which is 4%. So we are having 5.6 per cent growth when the rate of investment is 23.2 per cent of G.D.P. When we get about 7 per cent growth, there are partial adjustment of the RBI figures and the details available through the CSO.

The second thing is that if it goes from 6 to 7, it is possible, but, if it suddenly goes from 6 to 8 or 8.5 or 9, then, something is unnatural. We shall have to agree on the elastic band of 1 to 2 percentage point because our systems of computation are not that perfect.

With these words, Mr. VIce-Chairman, I thank you for the patience you have shown to me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Thank you, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee.

Mr. Mukherjee, perhaps I did not hear you properly or correctly. The three-and-a-half per cent growth was christened as the "Hindu Growth Rate" by Dr. Raj Krishna and not by Dr. Raja Chelliah.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am sorry. Yes, he was Dr. Raj Krishna.

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम लोगों ने बजट पर दो भाषण सुने। अग्रवाल जी ने इसकी शुरूआत की और पूर्व वित्तमंत्री व प्लानिंग कमीशन के पूर्व डिप्टी चेयरमेन साहब प्रणब मुखर्जी जी ने बड़े विस्तार से अपनी बातें कहीं। मैं उतने विस्तार से तो नहीं, लेकिन अपनी ओर से कुछ बात जरूर करना चाहूंगी। सबसे पहले मैं वित्तमंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहती हूं कि बहुत कम समय में, इनफेक्ट तीन सप्ताह में, उन्होंने अपना बजट तैयार किया।....(व्यवधान).... कुछ आवाज का प्रोब्लम है।

श्री एस.एस. अहलुवालिया (बिहार): आप बोलिए, बड़ी अच्छी आवाज आ रही है।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा : मेरी आवाज तो अच्छी है, मगर दूसरे की भी आवाज आ रही है, जो मुझे अच्छी नहीं लग रही।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं वित्तमंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहती हूं कि उन्होंने इतने कम समय में वर्तमान साल के लिए बजट तैयार किया और यूनाइटेड फ्रंट की सरकार जो नीति-निदेशक के आधार पर चल रही है, उसकी स्टीयरिंग कमेटी और उसके तहत जो बना हुआ कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम है उसके तहत यह बजट बनाया गया। बजट की विशेष दिशा भी तय की गई है।

महोदय, यहां पिछले दिनों से चर्चा हुई कि 1947-48 में पहला बजट बना 200 करोड़ का और आज के बजट के बारे में भी चर्चा की गई। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि आज का जो बजट है, इस बजट के पीछे कुछ कम्पलशन्स थे। हम लोगों ने देखा कि इस देश में पिछले कई वर्षों से, इनफेक्ट वर्ष 1980 से रिस्ट्रक्चरिंग आफ इकोनोमी चल रही है, वर्ल्ड बैंक और इंटरनेशनल मोनेटरी फंड की डायरेक्शन में यह रिस्ट्रक्चरिंग का काम हो रहा है। बाहर से कर्ज लेना और उस कर्ज के जरिए इस देश का काम चलाना, यह शुरू से ही आजाद हिन्दुस्तान में चल रहा था। हमने इस साल आजादी के अर्थ-शताब्दी वर्ष में पैर रखा है, लेकिन आज के हिन्दुस्तान को अगर देखें, मैं धन्यवाद देती हूं अग्रवाल साहब को कि उन्होंने आंकड़ों के सहारे यह कहा, कि आज भी गरीबी रेखा के नीचे 40 प्रतिशत से अधिक लोग हैं। सरकारी आंकड़े इससे बहुत कम बताते हैं। प्रणब बाबू सदन से बाहर चले गए। वह अगर मौजूद रहते तो मैं उन्हें बताती कि जिन बातों पर उन्होंने हमारी सरकार का क्रिटिसिज़्म किया, वह खुद ही उनको काट सकते थे। वे खुद ही सवाल भी कर सकते थे और जवाब भी दे सकते थे क्योंकि पिछले दिनों में सरकार के नीति-निर्धारण और बजट बनाने की प्रक्रिया में जो कुछ काम हुआ, वे उसके कर्णधार थे।

Passing on the buck to the other party is very simple.

अब वह जिम्मेदारी हमारे ऊपर है, युनाइटेड फ्रंट के ऊपर है। इतने दिनों का जो बोझ है, जो पाप है, जो कुकर्म है, जिसके नीचे यह देश दबा हुआ है, वह हमारे मत्थे है, इसको हम नकार नहीं सकते क्योंकि जब देवगौड़ा जी प्रधानमंत्री बने तो जिम्मेदारी तो उन्हीं की है।

उन्होंने इस जिम्मेदारी को निभाने के लिए दिशा निर्देशन दिया। उन्होंने कहा कि इस देश के 70 प्रतिशत लोग गांवों

में रहते हैं तो हमारा बजट ऐसा होना चाहिए जिससे रूरल सैक्टर का डेवलपमेंट हो, जो ग्रामोन्मुखी हो। पहली दफा ऐसा बजट बना है जो ग्रामोन्मुखी है। ग्रामीण अंचलों के विकास के लिए काम करना और सर्वसाधारण के लिए काम करना हमारे बजट का मुख्य उद्देश्य है। मैं इसके लिए वित्त मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देती हूं जिन्होंने अपने बजट के प्रियैम्बल में खुद ही कहा है कि इस बजट का मुख्य उद्देश्य है – ग्रामीण अंचलों में नए रोजगार मिलें इसके लिए आर्थिक संरचना को तैयार करना, इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर डेवलप करना, गरीबी दूर करना।

महोदय, गरीबी दूर करने की बात तो बहुत दिनों से हम सुनते आ रहे हैं। एक दफा तो बहुत जोर से यह नारा लगा कि गरीबी दूर करनी है और गरीबी हटाओ के नारे पर कांग्रेस सरकार भारी बहुमत से जीतकर आई लेकिन गरीबी नहीं गई और गरीब और बदतर हालत में चले गए। हम चाहते हैं कि उस तरह का नारा देकर नहीं बल्कि सचमुच में काम करके गरीबी दूर की जाए।

महोदय, हमारे देश में जो टैक्स का हिसाब-किताब है, यह इतना कांप्लिकेटेड है कि साधारण लोगों द्वारा इसे समझना बड़ा मुश्किल है। जो समझते हैं वे इतनी खूबी से समझते हैं कि टैक्स कभी देते ही नहीं हैं। बड़े-बड़े लोगों पर लाखों रूपए का टैक्स बकाया है जिसका कोई हिसाब-किताब ही नहीं है।

How to manipulate taxes?

और जो गरीब लोग हैं वे तो गरीब हैं, वे कहां से टैक्स देंगे? नतीजा यह है कि सरकार के खजाने में जो पैसा आना चाहिए वह आता नहीं है। इसलिए हमारी सरकार टैक्सेशन की पालिसी को सिंपल करना चाहती है जिससे कर की चोरी न हो और लोग स्वत: अपना टैक्स भरें।

महोदय, यहां कई बातों की चर्चा हुई। जैसे प्री-बजट इकनॉमिक सर्वे की बात की गई। मैं भी उसके बारे में कुछ कहना चाहती हूं। ठीक है, प्री-बजट इकनॉमिक सर्वे में जो हालत थी इस देश की, उसके बारे में कहा गया और यह भी कहा गया कि हमारे देश में पिछले दिनों जो उत्पादन हो रहा था, उसमें गिरावट आई है और गिरावट के कारण भी बताए गए। फौरन करेंसी कितनी थी, उसके आंकड़े भी बताए गए। यह भी बताया गया है कि हमारे देश में कृषि उत्पादन में गिरावट आई है। The rate of growth of agricultural crops, which averaged 4 per cent per annum during 1992-93 and 1994-95 slowed down to 0.9 per cent in 1995-96

तो इसमें कहा गया है कि कृषि उत्पादन कम होते गए। अंग्रेजी शब्द में कहा गया – "स्लगिश" होता गया भंडारों में अनाज तो है लेकिन कृषि उत्पादन के कम होने से चिंताजनक स्थिति सामने आ गई है। मेरे ख्याल से इसका एक कारण और है। पिछले दिनों रि-स्ट्रक्चरिंग की जो बातें कही जाती थी उसके साथ-साथ एक बात और कही जाती थी कि किराना सामग्री का उत्पादन ज्यादा किया जाए। किराना सामग्री – कैश क्रौप। कैश क्रौप का उत्पादन ज्यादा हो जिसको हम बाहर विदेशों में भेजकर रुपया कमा सकें। एक्सपोर्ट ओरिएंटेड क्रौप प्रोडक्शन ज्यादा हो। हमारे यहां लोगों ने यह किया। मैंने चार-पांच साल पहले उस समय भी बजट में भाग लेते हुए इसको कहा था कि हमारे सामने इथोपिया का नजारा है। अफ्रीका के कई देशों में ठीक इसी तरह रि-स्ट्रक्चरिंग के तहत कैश-क्रौप उगाना शुरू किया और अनाज उगाना छोड़ दिया

They had the money. The had agricultural products but they had no food. There were starvation deaths.

हमारे यहां किसानों ने काफी बड़ी संख्या में कैश क्रौप का उगाना शुरू किया और कैश क्रौप उगाने के कारण कृषि उत्पादन तो हुआ लेकिन अनाज का उत्पादन घटा। यह चिंताजनक बात है। हमारे यहां इथोपिया जैसी हालत नहीं होगी, इतना मुझे विश्वास है। महोदय, कई मुद्दें ऐसे हैं जिसके बारे में इकोनोमिक सर्वे 1995-96 अपडेट में कहा गया है। जैसे बिजली के बारे में 1995-96 में कहा है: "Performance of the core sector which was quite satisfactory during 1994-95 has been sustained in 1995-96."

लेकिन कुछ एरिया में चिंताजनक बातें तो हुई हैं। जैसे इलैक्ट्रिसिटी के बारे में है। अब यह कहा गया है "Electricity generation has continued to decline in 1996-97 only with 3.6 per cent growth in April-May 1996"

अब बिजली के उत्पादन में गिरावट हुई है। इसके भी कारण बताए गए हैं। लेकिन बिजली के उत्पादन में गिरावट होना यह डवलपमेंटल इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर का बहुत बड़ा कम्पोनेंट है। इलैक्ट्रिसिटी में गिरावट होने का मतलब होता है कि बाकी सभी विकास के रास्ते में रोड़ा आ जाना। अगर हम सरकारी आंकड़े को ही देखें तो बहुत सारे आंकड़े ऐसे हैं, हमारे बजट में कहा गया – पॉवर्टी एलिविएशन प्रोग्राम। बोझा इतना ज्यादा है। "सैंट्रल स्टेटिसस्टकल आर्गनाइजेशन डिपार्टमेंट आफ स्टेटिस्टिक्स मिनिस्ट्री आफ प्लानिंग एंड प्रोग्राम इम्प्लीमेंटेशन" की एक पुस्तक मेरे पास है। इसमें कुछ आंकड़े दिए गए हैं। डवलपमेंटल स्टेटिस्टिक्स – जिसका एक स्टेटिस्टिक्स तो यह है कि – एम्प्लोयमेंट इन आर्गनाइज्ड सैक्टर। इनके पास आंकड़े 1993 तक है या

जो पुस्तक मेरे पास आई है यह उसमें है। इसमें टोटल एम्प्लोयमेंट इन आर्गनाइज्ड सैक्टर दो करोड़ अड़सठ लाख छप्पन हजार। इसमें महिलाओं की संख्या 14 लाख है। अब दो करोड़ अड़सठ लाख आर्गनाइज्ड सैक्टर में है और अन-आर्गनाइज्ड सैक्टर में अगर आप देखें तो उनकी संख्या तो हम जानते हैं कि लगभग रूरल सैक्टर में ही 32 करोड़ है। जॉब सीकर जो लाइव रजिस्टर में हैं इनकी संख्या अगर हम देखें इस आंकड़े के तहत ता यह है तीन करोड़ बासठ लाख पिछत्तर हजार। लेकिन लेबर डिपार्टमेंट के जो दूसरे आंकड़े हैं उसमें यह कहा जाता है कि खासकर के अभी इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेस हुआ। उसमें जो स्टेटिस्टिक्स दिया गया, उसमें यह कहा गया।

"By the end of this Century, 100 million job-seekers will enter the job market." यानि दस करोड़ नए लोग 18 साल के हो जाएंगे जो नौकरी के लिए बाज़ार में आ जाएंगे और उनके लिए नौकरी नहीं होगी। तो हमारी सरकार चाहती है कि उनके लिए ग्रामीण रोज़गार की व्यवस्था की जाए। उसके लिए उन्होंने कुछ उपबन्ध भी किए हैं, मैं उन पर बाद में आऊंगी। हमारे दोनों पूर्व वक्ताओं ने डेफिसिट बजट की बात कही। अग्रवाल जी ने अपना भाषण समाप्त करते हुए एक कहानी सुनाई कि एक टैंक है। ऊपर से टैप से पानी आ रहा है तो टैंक में पानी कितनी देर में भर जाएगा? पर वह टैंक भरता नहीं था। इसका कारण यह था कि उसके नीचे एक छेद था। वह छेद क्या एक दिन में हुआ? उस छेद का कारण क्या है? कब से वह छेद बनना शुरू हुआ था? पहले उसका इनवेस्टिगेशन होना चाहिए कि किसने छेद किया? उस छेद से किसकी जेब में गया? कहां गया? इसके लिए इनवेस्टिगेशन होना चाहिए और आपको धन्यवाद इस बात के लिए देना चाहिए कि इस देश की जो इनवेस्टिगेशन ऐजेंसी है, वह खुद इनवेस्टिगेशन करके जिनकी जेबों में जा रहा है, उनको सीधे जेल भिजवाने का काम कर रही है। देर आयद दुरुस्त आयद अग्रवाल जी ने बहुत इमोशली कहा कि करप्शन को रोके बिना कुछ नहीं होगा। ठीक है, सही बात है, मैं उससे 100 परसेंट ऐग्री करती हूं। जब वोरा कमेटी के बारे में हम लोग बहस कर रहे थे तब हम लोगों ने ज़ोर से इस बात को कहा था कि करप्शन ऐट हाई प्लेसेज़ जब तक नहीं रुकेगा तब तक देश आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता। अब करप्शन ऐट प्लेसेज़ किस तरह से रुक सकता है? इसके बारे में कल्पना उस समय हमारे सामने नहीं थी लेकिन आज सबूत के साथ यह सामने आई है। हम नाम नहीं लेना चाहते लेकिन अखबार रोज़ रंगे रहते हैं। आप उनको पढ़ कर देखिए तो सही। सवाल है इसके लिए स्ट्रांग डिटरमिनेशन का और मैं यह गर्व के साथ कहना चाहती हूं कि युनाईटिड फ्रंट सरकार में वह स्ट्रांग डिटरमिनेशन है, वह पोलिटिक्ल विल है इस काम को करने की।

श्री गया सिंह (बिहार): उधर कोई सुनने वाला नहीं है मैडम।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): हम सुन रहे हैं। सामने भी सुन रहे हैं, उधर भी सुन रहे हैं।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: आप सुन रहे हैं, मुझे इसी में खुशी है। लेकिन एक बात जो चिंता की है और किसी भी बजट के लिए चिंता की बात होनी चाहिए, मुझे लगता है कि हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी के लिए भी यह चिंता की बात होगी कि हम डेफिसिट बजट बनाते जा रहे हैं। घाटे का बजट और घाटे का बजट आज से नहीं, शुरू से ही बनता आ रहा है। यह हमारी एक परंपरा बन गई है कि घाटे के बजट बनाओ। कंसॉलिडेटेड फंड से पैसा लेकर खर्च करो और फिर घाटे का बजट बनाओ। तो यह घाटे का बजट क्यों बन रहा है? बजट आखिर है क्या? हम परिवार जो चलाते हैं, हम भी अपने परिवार के लिए बजट बनाते हैं और जो आमदनी होती है, उसी सीमित आमदनी के तहत हम खर्चा मुकर्रर करते हैं कि कितना किस काम के लिए खर्च करेंगे और नेशनल बजट भी उसी तरह का है। The whole nation is treated like a family.

और इसके लिए बजट बनाया जा रहा है लेकिन Why is it a deficit budget for all these years? It is about 50 years now.

The Vice-Chairman (Shri V. Narayanasamy) *in the Chair.*

और नतीजा क्या हुआ कि हर साल विदेश का कर्ज़ा चुकाने के लिए देश के अंदर से जो हम कर्ज़ा लेते हैं, कैसे-कैसे कर्ज़ा लेते हैं, प्रणब बाबू उसका व्याख्यान करके चले गए। मैं उस व्याख्यान में नहीं जाना चाहती हूं क्योंकि दो व्याख्यान आपने सुने। मैं सीधी-सादी कॉमन मैन ऐप्रोच के साथ बात करना चाहती हूं। यह बजट जो साधारण लोगों को समझ में आता है, गांव के लोग भी पूछते हैं, शहरों में साधारण लोग यह पूछते हैं कि इतना कर्ज़ा हम क्यों लेते हैं? विदेशों का 60 हज़ार करोड़ रुपया हमको देना पड़ेगा इस बार। क्यों? और यह कर्ज़ा लेकर हमने क्या किया? क्या हमने इनफास्ट्रक्चर बनाया? क्या गांवों में लिंक रोड्स बनाई? क्या हमने अपने देश के एक-एक व्यक्ति को शिक्षित किया? क्या हमने महिलाओं के साथ न्याय किया? क्या उस समय देश में बच्चे काम नहीं करते थे? 2 करोड़ चाइल्ड लेबर यूनाइटेड नेशंस के हिसाब से इस देश में हैं। क्यों? Why is there huge borrowing? Why is there such an anamaly in our economy, in the Indian society?

क्योंकि इतना कर्जा लेने के बाद भी हम रोजी-रोटी के लिए समुचित इनफास्ट्रक्चर क्रिएट नहीं कर पाए। हमने बड़े-बड़े कारखानों से कमांडिंग हाइट्स ऑफ इंडियन इकॉनामि बनाया और हमने खुद उसको मारा। Commanding heights of the Indian economy are great. मैं बिहार से आती हूं । हमारे बिहार में हैवी इंजीनियरिंग कारपोरेशन है। एक बहुत बड़ा कारखाना खुला। पंडित जी उसमें उद्घाटन में गये थे और उन्होंने कहा था कि "This is going to be the mother of all the industries." लेकिन खुद गवर्नमेंट की इतने दिनों की पॉलिसी ने उस कारखाने को रुग्ण और जर्जर कर दिया और बी०आई०एफ०आर० में वह रैफर कर दिया गया। हाल में बी०आई०एफ०आर० से यह रिकॉमैंड होकर आया है कि इसका रिहैबिलीटेशन कराया जाए।

The industries which are supposed to be at the commanding heights of the Indian economy, which are supposed to be the mother of all the industries of India . आज उसकी यह हालत हो गया है, क्यों हुई? This is because we have been following wrong policies all these years.

जिसके कारण यह हालत हुई है। और आप चाहते हैं कि जुम्मा-जुम्मा 3 महीने भी नहीं हुए, तीन महीने हमारी सरकार को आए हुए हैं और आप कहते हैं कि यह क्यों नहीं हुआ, वह क्यों नहीं हुआ? मैं जानती हूं कि जो लोग उधर की कुर्सियों पर बैठेंगे, उनकी बात हमें सुननी होगी लेकिन जरा अपने अंदर झांककर देखिए और देखिए कि मेरे गुनाह के कारण देश कहां गया है, उसके बाद यह बात कीजिए कि यह कमी है। प्रणव बाबू बोल रहे थे कि उन्होंने चीफ मिनिस्टर्स की एक कमेटी बनायी थी, ऑस्टैरिटी कमेटी और उन्होंने उस समय कहा था कि देश को ऑस्टैरिटी करनी चाहिए। बीजू पटनायक जी को उस कमेटी का चेरयमैन बनाया गया था।

ट्रेड यूनियन के लोगों को भी उन्होंने सलाह के लिए बुलाया था। संयोग से हिन्द मजदूर सभा की उस समय मैं राष्ट्रीय अध्यक्ष थी। मुझे भी उस सलाह में जाने का मौका मिला था। तो सवाल क्या था? उन्होंने कहा कि वेज को दो साल के लिए फ्रीज़ करना है, बोनस दो साल के लिए फ्रीज़ करना है और इसके लिए आप राजीनामा दे दें। हमने कहा कि यह नामुमकिन है और वह कहा कि आपको क्या पता है, आप तो एयरकंडीशंड कमरे में बैठे हैं, आपके सरकारी ऑफीसर्स तो बैठे हैं, आपको नहीं पता है कि खेत में किसान किस तरह से धान बोते हैं और किस तरह से मेहनत करके दौलत पैदा करते हैं? कल-कारखानों में जो काम करते हैं, जो खेत मजदूर हैं या जो किसान हैं वह किस तरह से कष्ट उठाकर उत्पादन करते हैं। उनकी कमाई हुई तनख्वाह और उनको जो बोनस मिला है, उसको फ्रीज़ कर दो। हमने कहा . "I cannot be a signatory to such a thing." I refused to do it and I went away.

हमने कहा कि यह जिम्मेदारी हम नहीं ले सकते। आप दूसरे लोगों से करवा लीजिए।

But Kamla Sinha will be the last person to do it. वह नहीं हो पाया और आज उसका जिक्र यहां कर रहे थे। बजट 1947-48 का भी उन्होंने जिक्र किया। उन्होंने कहा कि उस समय बजट ऐसा था। आज पार्लियामेंट में समय का हम सदुपयोग नहीं करते हैं, इससे भी खर्चा बढ़ता है। बजट के संबंध में बात करते समय शायद एक बात उन्होंने भुला दी कि 1947-48 में रुपये की जो कीमत थी और आज रुपये की जो कीमत है, उसमें जमीन-आसमान का अंतर है। मुझे याद है, मैं 1952-53 की बात कर रही हूं। उस समय मैं छोटी थी। मेरे ग्रैंड फादर मेरे लिए मुर्शीदाबादी सिल्क की एक साड़ी 6 रुपये में खरीद कर लाए। My grandmother was so angry. इतनी छोटी लड़की के लिए इतनी महंगी साड़ी क्यों खरीदी, आपने बहुत पैसा बर्बाद कर दिया है। उस समय की बात और आज की बात देखिए तो वही साड़ी अगर आप आज खरीदने जाएं तो एक-डेढ़ हजार से कम दाम उसके आज नहीं होंगे। रुपये की कीमत कहां से कहां जा रही है, यह देखने की बात है रेलवे कैंटीन में उस समय 6 पैसे में खाना मिलता था और आज 25 रुपये में भी पेट भरकर खाना आप नहीं खा सकते हैं।

Where has the money value gone? Where has the rupee value gone? आज जेब में रुपया लेकर जाइये और झोला भरकर सामान लेकर आइये। पहले जेब में सौ रुपया लेकर जाते थे और बैलगाड़ी या ट्रक भरकर सामान लेकर आते थे। यह अन्तर आ गया है। हम खाली विदेश से कर्जा लेकर जिन्दा रहें तो यह जिन्दा रहना भी कोई जिन्दा रहना कहा जा सकता है। मैं सरकार से आग्रह करूंगी कि वह जो विदेशों से कर्जा लेती जा रही है उस कर्जे को कम करने की दिशा में कोई ठोस कदम उठाये। यह ठीक है कि पिछले दिनों ग्रोथ रेट में कमी हुई है और एग्रीकल्चर, फारेस्ट, फिशरी इन सब में भी कमी हुई है। हमारा एक्सपोर्ट बढ़ा नहीं है, लेकिन आज के दिनों में जो हम एक्सपोर्ट के लिए इम्फेसिस देते हैं,उसमें इस बात को हमें नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि हमारा एग्रो बेस्ड प्रॉडक्शन ज्यादा है और एक्सपोर्ट घटा है। Forty per cent to fifty per cent of our total exports are from agro-

based products. तो इनको प्रोपर बूस्ट करना होगा और तभी एक समानता हम ला पायेंगे। यदि हम बजट एट ए ग्लान्स को देखें तो पता चलेगा कि इसका कैसे-कैसे अलोकेशन हुआ है? इसके संबंध में मैं थोड़ा सा कहना चाहूंगी। कृषि हमारे देश की रीढ़ है। कृषि उद्योगों की भी जननी है, क्योंकि आज हम एग्रो बेस इन्डस्ट्री को डवलप करना चाहते हैं फूड प्रॉडक्शन, फूड प्रोसेसिंग इण्डस्ट्री का भी हम डवलपमेंट करना चाहते हैं, फलोरीकल्चर, हार्टीकल्चर एक-एक इण्डस्ट्री का हम डवलपमेंट करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन इसके लिए 1996-97 के बजट में 1471 करोड़ रुपये का अलोकेशन किया गया है जो कि पर्याप्त नहीं है। मुझे लगता है कि इतना बड़ा काम इतने धन से होना मुश्किल है।

हम हिन्दुस्तान में टूरिज्म को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। हमारे पास दुनिया को दिखाने के लिए बहुत कुछ है। हमारे पास पुरानी चीजें हैं, ऐतिहासिक चीजें हैं। अब दिल्ली शहर को ही लीजिए। दिल्ली शहर तो खंडहरों का शहर है और यहां पाण्डवों से लेकर हजारों साल का इतिहास भरा पड़ा है। यहां पर कुतुबमीनार, पुराना किला से लेकर बहुत सी चीजें हैं और इसी तरह की बहुत सी ऐतिहासिक चीजें पूरे देश में फैली हुई हैं। हम उनको समुचित ढंग से विकसित करें और देश में टूरिज्म को बढ़ावा दें तो बहुत बड़ी मात्रा में विदेशी पूंजी प्राप्त हो सकती है। इसके लिए हमें काफी इंटेन्सिव तरीकों से काम करना चाहिए।

मैं बिहार से आती हूं। मैं उदाहरण के साथ कहना चाहती हूं कि भगवान बुद्ध को बिहार के बोधगया में बोधत्व प्राप्त हुआ था। वैशाली में अनेकों बौद्धकालीन अवशेष प्राप्त हुये हैं। महात्मा बुद्ध ने सारी जिन्दगी बिहार में बिताई। वैशाली पुराना गणतंत्र है। बिहार में बोधगया का विकास हो सकता है, राजगीर का विकास हो सकता है। This can be brought into the international map.

उससे हमारे पास पैसे आ सकते हैं, हम धन का उपार्जन कर सकते हैं। लेकिन 50 साल से कुछ भी नहीं हुआ, अच्छी सड़कें भी नहीं बनी। यह किसका कसूर है? केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कुछ भी नहीं किया। अब आप कहेंगे कि बिहार में तो आपकी ही सरकार है। कितने दिनों से है? हमारी सरकार साढ़े पांच-छः साल से है। इसके अलावा ऐसे स्वनामधन्य बहुत से लोग थे, मैं उनके नाम नहीं लेना चाहती, जिन्होंने पटना के गांधी मैदान के रेलवे स्टेशन को गिरवी रख दिया था, बेच दिया था।

बिहार का समुचित विकास करने के लिए कोई प्रयास किया ही नहीं गया। इसी तरह पूरे देश में अनेकों ऐसी जगह हैं जहां टूरिज्म के लिए बहुत कुछ किया जा सकता था, लेकिन नहीं किया गया। इससे विदेशी मुद्रा हम अर्जित कर सकते थे। हमारी सरकार करना चाहती है लेकिन विदेशी कर्ज के बोझ से हम दबे हुए हैं, यह सरकार दबी हुई है। हम पुरानी सरकार के कृत्यों का फल भोग रहे हैं। हम अपने साधन जुटाने के लिए जितना हम कर सकते हैं उसको करने की कोशिश करेंगे।

दूसरी एक बात मैं कहना चाहूंगी As a public worker I have been really concerned about it. किसी भी देश के लिए यह कहा जाता है कि प्रकृति, पर्यावरण की सुरक्षा और संरक्षण बहुत आवश्यक है क्योंकि हमारे जीने के लिए तो We have just one earth to live. We have just one earth for the future generation. इसलिये कहा यह जाता है कि 33 परसेंट फोरस्ट कवर होना आवश्यक है। हिन्दुस्तान जब आजाद हुआ तो 29 प्रतिशत के करीब फोरस्ट कवर था। आज 9 प्रतिशत का है। डिग्रेडेशन ऑफ फारेस्ट जिस तरह से हुआ उसका कोई हिसाब नहीं है। उसका प्रभाव जल, वायु, मौसम और कृषि पर पड़ा है। यदि मैं अपने प्रान्त की ही बात कहूं हिमालय रीजन में जिस तरह से डिफारेस्टेशन हुआ और उसके कारण बिहार में बाढ़ का इतनी तेजी से आना शुरू हुआ कि बिहार प्रान्त हमेशा हर दूसरे-तीसरे साल भंयकर बाढ़ की चपेट में आ जाता है। These are all international rivers. उत्तरी बिहार में कोसी, गंडक और बागमती आदि अनेकों नदियां हैं। ये सारी नदियां पेरेनियल रीवर्स हैं। ये नेपाल से आती हैं और बिहार में प्रत्येक बरसात में कहार ढहाती हैं। इससे निरंतर देश में बाढ़ आती है। जिस साल बाढ़ न आये उस साल सूखा पड़ जाता है। This goes on in a cyclinder order.

इसी सदन में एक बार मेरे एक प्राइवेट मेम्बर के रिज्योलूशन में बड़ी लम्बी बहस हुई थी। उस समय संयोग से हमारी ही सरकार थी। उस समय के मंत्री जी ने यह कहा कि हम नेपाल सरकार के साथ एक ज्वाइन्ट वाटर कमीशन बनायेंगे और उस वाटर कमीशन के तहत ये जो पेरेनियल रीवर्स हैं जो बिहार में बाढ़ लेकर आती हैं, उसको किस ढंग से रोका जाये, उसके बारे में बात करेंगे। मैंने उस समय यह भी कहा था कि इससे हाइडल पावर जनरेशन हो सकती है। हमारे प्रान्त बिहार में बिजली की कमी है तो बिजली का उत्पादन हो सकता है। इससे केवल बिहार को ही नहीं दूसरे प्रांतों को भी बिजली मिलेगी। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य है कि अब तक यह काम नहीं हो पाया। आजादी के 50 सालों में यह काम नहीं हो पाया। केवल बिहार ही नहीं ऐसे अनेकों इलाके हैं जो इस तरह

से भुगत रहे हैं। This is the end result of deforestation of the whole area.

तो मैं यह चाहूंगी कि हमारी सरकार जो कि एक संवेदनशील सरकार है वह इस विषय पर भी ध्यान दे और इस ओर आवश्यक कदम उठाए।

मैं एक और विषय के बारे में बात किए बिना नहीं रह सकती और वह है स्वास्थ्य। इस देश में हेल्थ फार आल होना चाहिए, यह एक नैशनल बात है। लेकिन प्रैक्टिकली आज तक एज ए गवर्नमेंट पालिसी इसको आडाप्ट नहीं किया गया। तो हेल्थ फार आल, जो इस देश में पैदा हुआ उसे जीने का अधिकार है। मां के गर्भ से-जो पेट में किन्हीं कारणों से मार दिया जाता है उसके बारे में चर्चा नहीं करती, क्योंकि इस देश में लड़कियों को जन्म लेना ही पाप है। लेकिन जिन्होंने जन्म लिया है उनको स्वास्थ्य सेवा मिलना आवश्यक है। इस स्टैटिस्टिक्स की किताब में, सोशल एंड एकानामिक स्टैटिस्टिक में आंकड़े 1991-92 में आंकड़े दिए गए हैं, उनके अनुसार The type of medical attention at birth—1991-92, Delivery conducted in hospitals, nursing homes, health centres etc., etc.—17 per cent Delivery conducted at home by doctors/trained *dayis*—where there are *dayis* there are no doctors—trained mid-wife/trained nurses—20 per cent. Delivery conducted at home by untrained village *dayis* or untrained professional functionaries—62 per cent.

यह हमारे ग्रामीण अंचल के स्वास्थ्य की तस्वीर है और शहरों की क्या है। 26 परसेंट बच्चे यहां हास्पिटल मैटेरनटी और नर्सिंग होम में पैदा होते हैं और 19 परसेंट घर में ट्रेड दाइयों से और 90 per cent of delivery are is conducted at home by untrained village *dayis*. तो यह हालत है। तो अगर हेल्थ फार आल करना है तो हेल्थ का अलाटमेंट भी बढ़ाना होगा। हेल्थ अलाटमेंट मेरे ख्याल से बहुत कम है। हिन्दुस्तान एक बहुत बड़ा देश है। यहां की आबादी 90 करोड़ हो गई है एंड बाई दि एंड आफ दिस सैंचुरी यह 100 करोड़ हो जाएगी। इसके लिए इतना कम अलाटमेंट, हिन्दी में एक कहावत है कि ऊंट के मुंह में जीरे का पुड़न।

आज जो यह 815 करोड़ रुपये का अलाटमेंट है इससे बात बनने वाली नहीं है।

शिक्षा के बारे में मुझे खुशी है कि इसके लिए हमारी सरकार ने अलाटमेंट बढ़ाया है और ग्रामीण अंचल में भी शिक्षा की ओर ध्यान दिया है। फार दि फर्स्ट टाइम इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चरल डेवलपमेंट जिसमें एजूकेशन इज वन आफ दि इम्पार्टेन्ट कम्पोनेंट, इसकी ओर हमारी सरकार ने ध्यान देकर अलाटमेंट बढ़ाया है और इसे 383 करोड़ किया है।

लेकिन एक और एरिया है, जिसकी ओर ध्यान देना आवश्यक है। हम दुनिया में खेल-कूद में भाग लेने के लिए अपने बच्चों को भेजते हैं लेकिन वे सारे के सारे पिटकर, हारकर और मुंह लटकाकर वापस आ जाते हैं। यह बहुत ही शर्मनाक बात है। ये बच्चे भी खेल के मैदान में शर्म के मारे गढ़ जाते हैं और हम जो देश में टेलीवीजन पर बैठकर उन खेलों को देखते हैं तो हम भी शर्म के मारे गढ़ जाते हैं। हम ऐसा क्यों करते हैं? यह हमारी सरकार की बात नहीं है। हमारी सरकार को आए तो अभी चार दिन हुए हैं। यह जो पिछली सरकार थी उसका दोष है। अगर तैयारी नहीं होती तो क्यों हम अपने बच्चों को इंटरनेशनल गेम्स में, स्पोर्ट्स में भेजते हैं जब कि हम यहां उनको प्रापरली ट्रेन्ड नहीं करते और उनको प्रापरली इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चलर फैसेलिटीज नहीं देते। अगर ऐसा नहीं करते तो क्यों भेजते है जिससे हमारा सिर नीचा होता है। लियेंडर पाइस किसी तरह ब्रांज पदक लेकर आया तो हमने बड़ी तारीफ की कि जीतकर आया, जीतकर आया। लेकिन क्या बाकी बातों के लिए शर्म नहीं आयी।

And why only a bronze medal? Why not a gold medal? Why not a silver medal? Are we so incompetent?

हम उनको ट्रेनिंग नहीं देते हैं, इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चरल फैसिलिटी नहीं देते हैं। उसके लिए हमारे पास अलाटमेंट के लिए पैसा भी नहीं है because that area is the least priority area. अब सरकार के लिए तो रिसोर्स कान्स्ट्रेंट हैं तो उनके लिए भी वह लीस्ट प्रायोरिटी एरिया हो गया। 95 करोड़ का अलाटमेंट है। मैं तो चाहूंगी आइंदा अगर खेलकूद टीम को विदेश में भेजना हो, यहां से एक टीम जानी हो इंटरनेशनल स्पोर्ट्स में तो सही मायनों में उसे ट्रेनिंग देकर भेजा जाए। इसके लिए थोड़ा बहुत अलाटमेंट बढ़ाना हो तो बढ़ा भी देना चाहिए नहीं तो इस धंधे को बंद कर देना चाहिए।

एक एरिया में निश्चित रूप से अपनी सरकार को निवेदन करूंगी - Why should there be the Department for Women and Child Development? Why should women and child be clubed together? Why is it that man and child development cannot be taken together? I don't understand it. Is it because that women have to bear the children? इससे क्या होता है कि न बच्चों का विकास होता है न मां का विकास होता है।

अगर बच्चों का विकास करना है तो let there be a separate department for child development. जिसमें चाइल्ड लेबर वगैरह सारे का सारा एक कम्पोजिट कंप्रीहैंसिव आइडिया लेकर उसको किया जाए ताकि किसी भी परिवार के छोटे बच्चे रोजी रोजगार के लिए न जाएं, शिवकाशी के कारखाने में आतिशबाजी बनाकर वहां एक्सप्लोजन के साथ मर न जाएं, फिरोजाबाद के चूड़ियों के कारखानें में न जाएं, कारपेट के कारखाने में बच्चे नहीं जाएं। बच्चे स्कूल जाएं। उनको भी जीने का हक है। वे हमारे देश के भविष्य है। लेकिन यह काम सरकार ने वर्षों से नहीं किया है। मैं तो केवल अपनी सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहूंगी कि इस तरफ भी थोड़ा ध्यान दे ताकि आने वाले दिनों में जो पुराने पाप हैं उनको हम धो सकें, साफ कर सकें और एक नया रास्ता हम दे सकें। Women in this country do not have a development policy programme for themselves. इसलिए वीमेन डेवलपमेंट नहीं रख करके इस डिपार्टमेंट को कोई दूसरा नाम देना चाहिए और इसमें थोड़ा बहुत एलोकेशन भी बढ़ाना चाहिए।

एक दो बातें और कहकर समाप्त करूंगी। पीछे से हमारे नरेश भाई कुछ कर रहे हैं। मेरी बात की पूर्ति करना चाहते हैं वे।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे देश में जैसे ग्रामीण अंचल में 32 करोड़ लोग काम करते हैं, रूरल सेक्टर, रूरल अनआर्गेनाइज्ड सेक्टर में करीब-करीब 32 करोड़ लोग काम करते हैं। आर्गेनाइज्ड सेक्टर में 2 करोड़ लोग हैं। फिर इनफारमल सेक्टर है, सेल्फ इंप्लायड हैं। ये सारे जो काम करने वाले लोग हैं इनके लिए कोई एक वेज पालिसी नहीं है। हम लोग बारम्बार बात करते आए है कि एक नेशनल वेज पालिसी होनी चाहिए फार द अनआर्गेनाइज्ड सेक्टर, फार व सेल्फ इंप्लाइड एण्ड फार द इनफारमल सेक्टर। पब्लिक सेक्टर का तो ढांचा कमोवेश बना हुआ है या आर्गेनाइज्ड प्रायवेट सेक्टर का जिस तरह का काम है उसमें जैसे "टिस्को" का अपना अलग है, इसी तरह से जो बड़े-बड़े प्रायवेट सेक्टर्स हैं जैसे इंडियन टोबैको, ए.सी.सी., लार्सन एण्ड टुबरो इटसेट्रा, इनका अपना एक अलग इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर बना हुआ है, ढांचा बना हुआ है लेकिन जिनका नहीं है उनके लिए कुछ करना चाहिए इंप्लायमेंट दिनों दिन जो सिकुड़ता जा रहा है पिछले वर्षों की पालिसी के एंड रिजल्ट के हिसाब से इंप्लायमेंट जनरेशन न होकर इंप्लायमेंट का सिकुड़न, घटते जाना चिंताजनक बात है। अभी 24 तारीख को ही हम एक सेमीनार कर रहे थे एक संस्था के जरिए। हमारे प्रोग्राम इंपलीमेंटेशन और साइंस एण्ड टेक्नालाजी के मंत्री भी थे, रेलवे मंत्री भी थे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कुछ दिन पहले रेलवे से संबंधित कुछ कागजात पढ़ रही थी। मुझे बहुत हैरानी हुई the Ministry of Railways was the largest employer of this country. 20 लाख लोग जहां काम करते थे, आज 16 लाख रह गए हैं। इसका क्या कारण है? कारण है रिस्ट्रक्चरिंग ऑफ इंडियन इकॉनोमी। एंड-रिजल्ट वही है कि हर साल 2 प्रतिशत एम्प्लायमेंट रेलवे में घट जाता है। न्यू रिक्रूटमेंट नहीं होगा और हर साल 2 प्रतिशत लोग घट जाएंगे। फिर हर साल 3 प्रतिशत पोस्ट्स कैंसिल करके सरैंडर कर देना है गवर्नमेंट को। इस का मतलब यह है कि 5 प्रतिशत पोस्ट्स घट जाना है। दूसरी बात जो रेल मंत्री जी ने स्वयं अपने मुंह से कही, वह है कैजुअलाइजेशन ऑफ लेबर। हरेक क्षेत्र में, हरेक इंडस्ट्री में कैजुअलायजेशन ऑफ लेबर बढ़ता जा रहा है because of new economic policy and globalisation of economy. हम मजबूरन उस को फोलो कर रहे हैं क्योंकि एक जो प्रक्रिया 10-15 साल से शुरू हो चुकी है, उसको ही अचानक बंद नहीं कर सकते।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): Madam, there is another Member from your party. You should allow him also.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Sir, I am concluding. I will finish within 2-3 minutes.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: There is a Statement by the Home Minister at five o'clock.

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कह रही थी कि एक जो बहुत ही इम्पोर्टेन्ट एरिया है जिस पर कि बहुत ध्यान देने की जरूरत है, वह है एनर्जी सेक्टर। यह सही है कि हमारी सरकार इसे 5901 मेगावाट एडीशनल इंस्टॉल कैपेसिटी करना चाहती है और इस के लिए 390.4 बिलियन यूनिट्स का जनरेशन टार्गेट बनाया हुआ है। इस में हायडल पावर का एक बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा हो सकता है क्योंकि हायडल पावर में इनपुट कास्ट इनीशियल स्टेज में ज्यादा होती है, लेकिन मैंटेनेंस कॉस्ट कम होती है। थर्मल पावर में इनपुट कास्ट और मैंटेनेंस कॉस्ट दोनों बराबर होती है। जब तक वह चलेगा तब तक आप को खर्च देना पड़ेगा और पानी का स्रोत तो बराबर आता जाएगा। इसलिए हायडल पावर के ऊपर हम लोगों को जोर देना चाहिए। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, संयोग से हमारे साइंस एंड टैक्नोलोजी मंत्री यहां हैं। मैं उन से निवेदन करूंगी कि वह इस बात

पर जरूर ध्यान देंगे क्योंकि पावर एक ऐसा इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर है जिस के बगैर कोई डवलपमैंट का काम नहीं हो सकता। जहां कहीं बिजली पहुंच जाए वहां स्वत: सड़क चली जाती है, छोटा-मोटा कल-कारखाना चला जाता है और स्वत: उस इलाके का विकास होना शुरू हो जाता है।

Electricity is the most important component, most important infrastructure of developmental process. We msut not forget this. इस के लिए उस के ऊपर जितनी भी एम्फैसिस देना हो, वह स्वत: आप कैबिनेट में देते रहे, यह मेरा आप से निवेदन है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे यहां धरती के नीचे अपार कोयले का भंडार है, लेकिन उस में जिस ढंग से काम होना चाहिए, वह नहीं हुआ है। नतीजा यह है कि हमारे यहां अब हम विदेशों से कोयला मंगा रहे हैं। महोदय, हम इस देश में जितना कोयला इस्तेमाल करते हैं, उस का 25 प्रतिशत आस्ट्रेलिया, इंडोनेशिया वगैरा से मंगाते हैं और दलील यह दी जाती है कि इस कोयले में "एश कन्टैंट" कम है। हमारे यहां के कोयले में 18-20 परसैंट एश कन्टैंट है और विदेशी कोयले में 5-6 परसैंट एश कन्टैंट है। इसलिए उसकी युटिलिटी ज्यादा है, ऐंड रिजल्ट उसका ज्यादा होगा और हमारे यहां के कोयला के ऐंड रिजल्ट कम है। अच्छा है, इसकी एक दलील यह भी हो सकती है कि हम अपने देश के कोयले को बचाकर रख रहे हैं। अभी बाहर से खरीद रहे हैं, जब तक खरीद सकते हैं। One of the positive arguments that can be advanced is that our own reserves would be intact and would last for a longer period. This is one of the positive arguments which I can understand. But I cannot understand the argument .... कि हमारे यहां का कोयला खराब है। हमारे यहां का कोयला खराब नहीं है। हमारे यहां का कोयला बहुत अच्छा है। बिहार में कई कंपनी हैं। इस देश का 40 से 42 प्रतिशत कोयला बिहार उत्पन्न करता है।

I have a close, intimate relationship with the coalfields. I know it for sure because I work among the workers. So. I know about it very thoroughly. हमारे यहां का कोयला बहुत ही अच्छी केटेगरी का कोयला होता है, लेकिन उसमें भी तरह तरह का गलत काम किया जाता है और उसके कारण ही इस तरह की बातें कही जाती हैं, सामने आती हैं। तो मैं सरकार को यह कहना चाहूंगी कि इस मामले में भी सरकार थोड़ा चौकस रहे ताकि कोई गलत काम उसमें न हो। Non-conventional energy is another source.

हमारा यह देश जैसे गरम देश है। यहां साल में आठ महीना, सात महीना लगातार सूरज की रोशनी मिलती है, जिसमें चार महीना तो भयंकर गरमी होती है। Why cannot we use solar energy for our purposes? We don't make use of this source. यहां आप इसको नहीं कर रहे हैं। पता नहीं, क्यों? इसको डवलप करना चाहिए। इस सोलार एनर्जी का युटिलाइजेशन होना चाहिए। बायोगैस का भी हो सकता है। नौन कन्वेंशनल एनर्जी का भी यहां हो सकता है। डेनमार्क एक छोटा सा देश है। वह पावर जनरेट करता है, हवा से करता है, जो समुद्र की हवा है या नदी की हवा है, उससे करता है। तो हम क्यों नहीं कर सकते? We cannot do anything. We have not been doing it.

एक्सपेरीमैंट के बेसिस पर एक दो जगह कहीं-कहीं करते हैं। दो साल पहले मुझे डेनमार्क एक जगह जाने का मौका मिला। एक सम्मेलन था डेनमार्क में। वह स्थान शहर से दूर था, गांव में It was a huge infrastructure. It has a conference building. लोगों के ठहरने की जगह, आदि सब कुछ था और पूरा का पूरा The whole electricity requirement was met from the wind mills. Why cannot we do it? We have failed to move in a positive direction.

हमारी सरकार दिशा बदलना चाहती है, नई दिशा में जाना चाहती है। मैं यह चाहूंगी कि इस सदन के सभी सदस्य, ...(व्यवधान)... ठीक है, आप विरोधी पक्ष में बैठे हैं तो आपको विरोध तो करना की चाहिए। It is a ritual which we have to follow.

लेकिन रिचुअल को फॉलो करने के बाद जो एक पोजिटिव डायरेक्शन वाला बजट आया है, उसका आप वेलकम कीजिए, हमारे वित्तमंत्री और प्रधानमंत्री को धन्यवाद दीजिए।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ आपका धन्यवाद करती हूं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): Thank you, Shrimati Kamla Sinha. Now, Shri N.K.P. Salve.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Sir, before we started the debates today, we had decided to carry on the debate until 6.00 p.m. What is the situation now? In the Supplementary List of Business, it is stated that at 5.00 p.m., there is a statement on Amarnath Yatra by the Home Minister.

SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, let the statement be made before Mr. Salve starts his speech.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): Actually, at 5.00 p.m., the Home Minister is to make a statement on Amarnath Yatra. In the afternoon, hon. Members wanted the discussion on the Budget on continue up to 6.00 p.m. If the House agrees .... *(interruptions)*...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Sir, what they wanted was an uninterrupted discussion until 6.00 p.m. Now it is interrupted. The crucial question is, after he makes the statement, there are going to be clarifications on that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): The Home Minister has not yet come. Therefore, interruption has not yet started.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Salve is not expected to finish his speech within five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): If the House so agrees ... *(interruptions)*.. One minute. Let me solve the problem. The hon. senior leader has raised a question. I would submit that if the House so agrees, we will continue the discussion on the Budget up to 6.00 p.m.

5.00 P.M.

Then, we will take up discussion on the Home Minister's statement at 6'0 clock. If the House doesn't want, then we will take up the statement of the Home Minister. *(Interruptions)*

RE: DEMAND FOR A STATEMENT ON AMARNATH YATRA TRAGEDY—*Contd.*

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: I think the consensus of the House at that point of time really was that the Home Minister may be requested to come at six so that the senior Members of the House representing various important political parties are able to finish their speeches and comments on the Budget. But it seems that somehow it has not worked, though I thought that probably the Government's response was positive. That is why it is only in the fitness of things, because if Mr. Salve has to start now, he will start only ritualistically and then he will have to continue with his speech the day after tomorrow, when we meet again. If he starts now and then resumes after another hour, after the discussion on the Home Minister's statement is over, the chain of his thoughts and his presentation will be disturbed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): No, no. You have not followed what I said. If the House so agrees, we will continue with the Budget discussion and then at six we will ask the Home Minister to make his statement. But, if the Members want that the Home Minister's statement should be at 5 0'clock, we will go by that. The House is supreme. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): But in the supplementary list ...*(Interruptions)* The Home Minister has come. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SURESH PACHOURI (Madhya Pradesh): We may seek clarifications later.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: No, the clarifications must be taken up today.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): When there is division in the House, I will go by the supplementary list. If there is unanimity, then Mr. Salve can continue with his Budget speech up to 6 o'clock, as agreed to at 2 o'clock. Yes, Mr. Home Minister.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA): I will abide by whatever your directions are. But my difficulty is that after he has made his speech ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Are you going to allow clarifications?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): I would like to know the mood of the House. *(Interruptions)* If the House so agrees, ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI (Madhya Pradesh): If he makes the statement, you must allow clarifications right thereafter. Mr. Salve's speech may be postponed to the day after tomorrow. *(Interruptions)* Now that the Home Minister is here, let him make the statement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) Mr. Home Minister, will you make the statement at six? *(Interruptions)*

17-859, GIPMR/97